arXiv:1412.1686v1 [math.AG] 4 Dec 2014

ON THE CHERN NUMBERS OF A SMOOTH THREEFOLD

PAOLO CASCINI AND LUCA TASIN

Abstract. We study the behavior of the Chern numbers of a smooth projective threefold under a divisorial contraction.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Preliminary Results 5
2.1. Notations 5
2.2. Terminal singularities on threefolds 6
2.3. Cubic Forms 8
2.4. Reduced forms 9
2.5. Cubic forms on threefolds 11
2.6. Topology of threefolds 11
3. Cubics in reduced form 14
3.1. Points of low rank for a cubic form 14
3.2. Binary and ternary cubics 26
3.3. General cubics 30
4. Proof of the main results 36
4.1. Bounding the volume 36
4.2. Divisorial contractions 37
4.3. Proof of the main theorem 41
References 42

1. Introduction

The goal of this paper is to study the Chern numbers of a smooth projective threefold. In particular, we are motivated by the following question of Hirzebruch [Hir54]:

The first author was partially supported by an EPSRC Grant. The second author is funded by the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in Bonn. We would like to thank G. Codogni, S. Lu, C. Mautner, M. McQuillan and D. Panov for several very useful discussions.

Question 1.1 (Hirzebruch)**.** *Which linear combinations of Chern numbers on a smooth complex projective variety are topologically invariant?*

The question has been answered by Kotschick [Kot08, Kot12], who showed that a rational linear combination of Chern numbers is a homeomorphism invariant of smooth complex projective varieties if and only if it is a multiple of the Euler characteristic. In particular, Kotschick shows the existence of a sequence of infinitely many pairs of smooth projective threefolds X_i, Y_i, with $i \in \mathbb{N}$, such that X_i and Y_i are diffeomorphic and

$$c_1c_2(X_i) \neq c_1c_2(Y_i) \qquad \text{and} \qquad c_1^3(X_i) \neq c_1^3(Y_i)$$

for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

In view of this, it is natural to ask if the Chern numbers of an n-dimensional smooth projective variety can only assume finitely many values, after we fix the underlying manifold. In general, c_n is a topological invariant, as it coincides with the Euler characteristic, and therefore if $n = 1$ then the problem is easily settled. On the other hand, if X and Y are homeomorphic complex surfaces, then either $c_1^2(X) = c_1^2(Y)$ or $c_1^2(X) = 4c_2(Y) - c_1^2(Y)$, depending on whether the homeomorphism within X and Y is orientation preserving or not (cfr. [Kot08]).

In dimension three, the relevant Chern numbers are c_1c_2 and c_1^3. If X is Kähler, then by the Hirzebruch-Riemann-Roch theorem we have

$$|\frac{1}{24}c_1c_2(X)| = |\chi(\mathcal{O}_X)| = |1 - h^{1,0} + h^{2,0} - h^{3,0}| \leq 1 + b_1 + b_2 + b_3,$$

where $h^{i,0} = h^i(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ and b_1, b_2 and b_3 denote the topological Betti numbers of X. Thus, $c_1c_2(X)$ is bounded by a linear combination of the Betti numbers of X. On the other hand, LeBrun [LeB99] shows that the same result does not hold if we drop the assumption of being Kähler, answering a question raised by Okonek and Van de Ven [OVdV95]. In particular, he shows that if M denotes the 4-manifold underlying a K3 surface and S^2 is the two dimensional sphere, then there exist inifintely many complex structures J_m on $M \times S^2$ such that $c_1c_2 = 48m$, with $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Thus, the motivating question of this paper is the following

Question 1.2. [Kot08, Problem 1] *Does $c_1^3 = -K_X^3$ take only finitely many values on the projective algebraic structures X with the same underlying 6-manifold?*

Our main result is the following:

Theorem (Theorem 4.11)**.** *Let X be a smooth complex projective threefold which is not uniruled and let F_X be its associated cubic (cf. Section 2.5). Assume that $\Delta_{F_X} \neq 0$ and that there exists a birational moprhism $f\colon X \to Y$ onto a minimal projective threefold Y (cf. Section 2.1), which is obtained as a composition of divisorial contractions to points and blow-downs to smooth curves in smooth loci.*

Then there exists a constant D depending only on the topology of the 6-manifold underlying X such that

$$|K_X^3| \leq D.$$

Recall that a smooth projective variety is said to be *uniruled* if it is covered by rational curves, i.e. for each $x \in X$ there exists a non-trivial morphism $f\colon \mathbb{P}^1 \to X$ such that $x \in f(\mathbb{P}^1)$.

The proof of Theorem 4.11 is obtained by combining together methods in birational geometry, topology and arithemetic geometry. We now explain more in details the techniques that we use and we justify some of the assumptions of the main Theorem.

Let X be a smooth threefold. We first consider Question 1.2 in three extreme cases which arise as building blocks in birational geometry: Fano manifolds, Calabi-Yau and canonically polarized varieties. In the first case, it is known that X belongs to a bounded family and in particular K_X^3 is bounded [Kol93a]. If X is a Calabi-Yau, then by definition $K_X = 0$ and therefore $K_X^3 = 0$. Finally, if X is canonically polarized (i.e. K_X is ample), then the Bogomolov-Miyaoka-Yau inequality implies that $0 < K_X^3 \leq 8/3 c_1 c_2(X)$. Thus, the arguments above imply that K_X^3 is bounded by the Betti numbers of X.

We now consider the general case of a smooth projective threefold X. Thanks to Mori's program [KM98], we can run a Minimal Model Program (MMP, in short) on X and obtain a birational map $\varphi\colon X \dashrightarrow Y$ into a threefold Y such that either X is not uniruled and Y is minimal (i.e. the canonical divisor K_Y is nef) or X is uniruled and Y admits a Mori fibre space structure (i.e. a morphism $Y \to Z$ with connected fibres with relative Picard number equal to one and whose general fibre is a non-trivial Fano variety). Thus, our strategy consists in two steps: we first want to bound K_Y^3 and then bound $K_X^3 - K_Y^3$.

One of the difficulties of the first step is due to the fact that in general Y is not smooth, but it admits some mild singularities, called terminal. On the other hand, by [CZ12], we can bound the singularities of Y, and in particular the index of each singularity, by a bound which depends only on the topology of X (see Proposition 2.3).

Note that if X is not uniruled then Y is minimal and K_Y^3 coincides with the volume of X (cf. definition 2.1), which is a birational invariant

of the variety X. Thanks to the Bogomolov-Miyaoka-Yau inequality for terminal threefolds, we obtain:

Theorem (Theorem 4.1)**.** *Let X be a smooth complex projective threefold which is not uniruled.*

Then

$$\mathrm{vol}(X, K_X) \leq 72 \left(b_1(X) + b_3(X) + \frac{1}{12} b_2(X) \right).$$

An interesting consequence is that the volume only takes finitely many values on the family of smooth projective varieties of general type with fixed underlying 6-manifold (see Corollary 4.2) .

In a forthcoming paper, we plan to study the Chern numbers of a variety Y which admits a Mori fibre space structure.

We now consider the second step of our program: we want to determine how c_1^3 varies under the Minimal Model Program. Recall that if X is a smooth projective threefold and we run a MMP on X, then we obtain a birational map $X \dashrightarrow Y$ as a composition of elementary transformations, given by divisorial contractions and flips:

$$X = X_0 \dashrightarrow X_1 \dashrightarrow \ldots \dashrightarrow X_m = Y.$$

We plan to bound $K^3_{X_k} - K^3_{X_{k-1}}$ at each step, $k = 1, \ldots, m$.

In this paper, we consider the case of divisorial contractions. Recall that a divisorial contraction $X_{k-1} \to X_k$ is a birational morphism which contracts a prime divisor E into either a point or a curve. The first case can be easily handled thanks to Kawakita's classification [Kaw05]. In particular, we can show that:

$$0 < K^3_{X_{k-1}} - K^3_{X_k} \leq 2^{10} b_2^2,$$

where $b_2 = b_2(X)$ is the second Betti number of X (see Proposition 4.4). The case of divisorial contraction to curves is much harder. In general, in this case, the difference between the Chern numbers may not be bounded by a combination of Betti numbers (e.g. consider a blow-up of a rational curve of degree d in $\mathbb{P}^3$). To deal with this situation we study the integral cubic form F_{X_i} associated to the cup product on $H^2(X_i, \mathbb{Z})$. Many topological information of a threefold X are encoded in the cubic F_X (e.g. see [OVdV95]). In the case of a blow-down to a smooth curve $f : W \to Z$ the cubic F_W assumes a special form

$$F_W(x_0, \ldots, x_n) = a x_0^3 + 3 x_0^2 (\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i x_i) + F_Z(x_1, \ldots, x_n),$$

which we call *reduced form*. The goal of Section 3 is to prove a finiteness result on the number of possible reduced forms in the case of cubics with non-zero discriminant (see Theorem 3.1).

In particular, we can associate to any projective threefold X a topological invariant S_X which is a integer number depending only on the cubic F_X of X (see Definition 2.13). We can then prove that if $f : W \to Z$ is a blow-down to a smooth curve, then

$$|K_W^3 - K_Z^3| \leq 2S_W + 6(b_3(W) + 1)$$

(see Theorem 4.9). Our main Theorem 4.11 is a consequence of these bounds.

It remains to study divisorial contractions to singular curves and flips. On the other hand, the Minimal Model Program of any smooth projective threefold may be also factored into a sequence of flops, blow-up along smooth curves and divisorial contractions to points (see [CH11, Che13]). Recall that if $W \dashrightarrow Z$ is a flop, then $K_W^3 = K_Z^3$; thus, it is crucial to study how the cubic form F varies under flops. We will study this problem in a forthcoming paper.

2. Preliminary Results

2.1. **Notations.** We work over the field of complex numbers. We refer to [KM98] for the classical notions in birational geometry. In particular, if X is a normal projective variety, we denote by K_X the *canonical divisor* of X. We also denote by $\rho(X)$ the *Picard number* of X, by $N^1(X)$ the group of Cartier divisors modulo numerical equivalence and by $\bar{H}^i(X, \mathbb{Z})$ the i-th singular cohomology group of X modulo its torsion subgroup. In particular, $b_i(X) = \operatorname{rk} \bar{H}^i(X, \mathbb{Z}) = \dim H^i(X, \mathbb{Q})$ is the i-th *Betti number* of X. We say that X is $\mathbb{Q}$-*factorial* if every Weil divisor D on X is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, i.e. there exists a positive integer m such that mD is Cartier. If $f\colon Y \to X$ is a birational morphism within normal projective varieties and K_X is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, then we may write

$$K_Y = f^*K_X + \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i E_i$$

where the sum is over all the exceptional divisors $E_1, \ldots, E_k$ of f. The number a_i is the *discrepancy* of f along E_i and it is denoted by $a(E_i, X)$. In particular, X is said to be *terminal* if for any birational morphism $f\colon Y \to X$ and for any exceptional divisor E, we have $a(E, X) > 0$. Recall that terminal singularities are *rational*, i.e. if $f\colon Y \to X$ is a resolution then $R^i f_* \mathcal{O}_Y = 0$ for all $i > 0$. A terminal variety X is said to be *minimal* if K_X is nef.

A *contraction* $f\colon X \to Y$ is a proper birational morphism within normal projective varieties. The contraction $f\colon Y \to X$ is said to be *divisorial* if the exceptional locus of f is an irreducible divisor. It is said to be *elementary*, if $\rho(Y) = \rho(X) + 1$. Finally, an elementary contraction $f\colon Y \to X$ is said to be K_Y-*negative*, if $-K_Y$ is f-ample, i.e. the exceptional locus of f is covered by curves ξ such that $K_Y \cdot \xi < 0$. Note that if Y is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial and $f\colon Y \to X$ is an elementary divisorial contraction, then X is also $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Moreover, if Y is terminal and f is K_Y-negative, then X is also terminal.

Definition 2.1. Let X be a projective variety with terminal singularities. Then, the *volume* of X is given by

$$\mathrm{vol}(X) = \limsup_{m\to\infty} \frac{n!\ h^0(X, mK_X)}{m^n}$$

where n is the dimension of X.

In particular, the volume is a birational invariant and if X is a minimal variety of dimension n then

$$\mathrm{vol}(X) = K_X^n$$

(see [Laz04, Section 2.2.C] for more details).

2.2. **Terminal singularities on threefolds.** We now recall few known facts about terminal singularities in dimension three. Let (X, p) be the germ of a three-dimensional terminal singularity. The *index* of p is the smallest positive integer r such that rK_X is Cartier. In addition, it follows from the classification of terminal singularities [Mor85], that there exists a deformation of (X, p) into a variety with $h \geq 1$ terminal singularities $p_1, \ldots, p_h$ which are isolated cyclic quotient singularities of index $r(p_i)$. The set $\{p_1, \ldots, p_h\}$ is called the *basket* $\mathcal{B}(X, p)$ of singularities of X at p [Rei87]. As in [CH11], we define

$$\Xi(X, p) = \sum_{i=i}^{h} r(p_i).$$

Thus, if X is a projective variety of dimension 3 with terminal singularities and $\mathrm{Sing}\, X$ denotes the finite set of singular points of X, we may define

$$\Xi(X) = \sum_{p\in \mathrm{Sing}\, X} \Xi(X, p).$$

Lemma 2.2. *Let (X, p) be the germ of a three-dimensional terminal singularity and let $\mathcal{B}(X, p)$ be the basket at p.*

Then, for each $q \in \mathcal{B}(X, p)$, the index $r(q)$ of q divides $4 \cdot \Xi(X, p)$

Proof. It follows from the classification of terminal singularities [KM98], that the points of the basket $\mathcal{B}(X,p)$ either have all the same index r or their index divides 4. Thus the claim follows. □

By [CZ12, Proposition 3.3], we have:

Proposition 2.3. *Let X be a smooth projective threefold and assume that*

$$X = X_0 \dashrightarrow \ldots \dashrightarrow X_k = Y$$

is a sequence of steps for the K_X-minimal model program of X.

Then

$$\Xi(Y) \leq 2b_2(X).$$

In particular, the inequality holds if Y is the minimal model of X.

In the proof of our main theorem, we will use the following versions of the Bogomolov-Miyaoka-Yau inequality and the Riemann Roch formula for terminal threefolds:

Theorem 2.4. *Let Y be a minimal three-dimensional projective variety with terminal singularities.*

Then

$$(3c_2 - c_1^2).c_1 \leq 0.$$

Proof. It follows from [Miy87, Theorem 1.1] □

Theorem 2.5. *Let Y be a three-dimensional projective variety with terminal singularities.*

Then the holomorphic Euler characteristic of Y is given by

$$\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) = \frac{1}{24}(-K_Y \cdot c_2(Y) + e)$$

where

$$e = \sum_{p_\alpha} \left(r(p_\alpha) - \frac{1}{r(p_\alpha)} \right),$$

and the sum runs over all the points of all the baskets of Y.

Proof. See [Kaw86, Rei87]. □

2.3. **Cubic Forms.** For any polynomial $P \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$, we denote by $\partial_i P(x)$ the partial derivative of P with respect to x_i at the point $x \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. For any ring $R \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ and for any positive integer d, we denote by $R[x_0 \dots, x_n]_d$ the set homogeneous polynomials of degree d with coefficients in R.

Given a cubic $F \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$, i.e. an homogeneous polynomial of degree 3, let

$$\mathcal{H}_F(x) = (\partial_i \partial_j F(x))_{i,j}$$

be the Hessian of F at the point $x \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. Note that, for any $x \in \mathbb{C}$ and for any $\lambda \neq 0$, the rank of $\mathcal{H}_F$ at the point λx is constant with respect to λ and therefore we will denote, by abuse of notation, $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F(p)$ to be the rank of $\mathcal{H}_F$ at any point in the class of $p \in \mathbb{P}^n$. We say that F is *non-degenerate* if $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F$ is maximal at the general point of $\mathbb{P}^n$.

Let $F(x_0, \dots, x_n) = \sum_I c_I x^I \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_n]_d$. Then the *discriminant* Δ_F of F is the unique (up to sign) polynomial with integral coefficients in the variables c_I such that Δ_F is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\Delta_F = 0$ if and only if the hypersurface $\{F = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n_{\mathbb{C}}$ is singular (see [GKZ94, pag. 433] for more details).

Lemma 2.6. *Let $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x_0, \dots, x_n]_3$ be an integral cubic form and assume that*

$$F(x_0, \dots, x_n) = a x_0^3 + x_0^2 (\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i x_i) + G(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

for some $G \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_3$. Then Δ_G divides Δ_F.

Proof. If P is a polynomial with integral coefficients we denote by $\operatorname{ct}(P)$ the *content* of P, that is the gcd of the coefficients of P. As in the case of one variable, it is easy to see that the content is multiplicative.

Let A, $\{B_i\}_{i=1,\dots,n}$ and $\{C_J\}$ be variables and consider the cubic form

$$f = A x_0^3 + x_0^2 (\sum_{i=1}^{n} B_i x_i) + g(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

where $g = \sum_J C_J x^J$. Then Δ_f and Δ_g are polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}[A, B_i, C_J]$. We are going to prove that Δ_g divides Δ_f.

Let $R = \mathbb{C}[A, B_i, C_J]$ and let $Z(f), Z(g) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^N_{\mathbb{C}} = \operatorname{Proj} R$ be the closed subsets defined by $\Delta_f = 0$ and $\Delta_g = 0$ respectively. Note that $Z(g) \subseteq Z(f)$ because if $\{g = 0\}$ has a singular point $z = [z_1, \dots, z_n]$, then $[0, z_1, \dots, z_n]$ is a singular point of $\{f = 0\}$. Since Δ_g is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$ by definition, and hence $Z(g)$ is reduced over $\mathbb{C}$, we deduce that $\Delta_f = \Delta_g \cdot H$ where $H \in R$.

We need to show that $H \in \mathbb{Z}[A, B_i, C_J]$. We start assuming by contradiction that $H \notin \mathbb{Q}[A, B_i, C_J]$. Fix an order on R and consider the maximal monomial m in H such that its coefficient is not rational. Consider now the product between m and the highest monomial in Δ_g to get a contradiction. Hence $H \in \mathbb{Q}[A, B_i, C_J]$.

The claim follows from the fact that the content of Δ_g is 1 and that the content is multiplicative. □

Let $F \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z]$ be a cubic form. We denote by S_F and T_F the two $\mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{C})$-invariants of F as defined in 4.4.7 and 4.5.3 of [Stu93]. Recall that the discriminant of F satisfies

$$\Delta_F = T_F^2 - 64 S_F^3.$$

We have:

Lemma 2.7. *Let $F \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ be a cubic such that there exists a point $p \in \mathbb{P}^n$ for which $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F(p) = 0$ (i.e. $\mathcal{H}_F(p)$ is the trivial matrix).*

Then after a suitable coordinate change, F depends on at most n variables. In particular, $\det \mathcal{H}_F$ vanishes identically on $\mathbb{P}^n$.

Proof. Euler's formula for homogeneous polynomials implies that

$$F(p) = \partial_i F(p) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i = 0, \ldots, n.$$

After a suitable coordinate change, we may assume that $p = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)$. Let $f(y_1, \ldots, y_n) = F(1, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$. By Taylor's formula, f is a homogeneous polynomial of degree 3. Thus, $F(x_0, \ldots, x_n) = f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and the claim follows. □

As mentioned in the introduction, arithmetic geometry will play an important role for the proof of our main theorem. In particular, we need the following:

Theorem 2.8 (Siegel Theorem)**.** *Let R be a finitely generated ring over $\mathbb{Z}$ and let C be an affine smooth curve with genus $g \geq 1$.*

Then there are only finitely many R-integral points on C.

Proof. See [Lan83, Ch. 8, Theorem 2.4]. □

2.4. **Reduced forms.** Given a cubic form $F \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ and a matrix $T \in \mathrm{GL}(n+1, \mathbb{C})$, we will denote by $T \cdot F$ the cubic given by

$$T \cdot F(x) = F(T \cdot x).$$

We define

$$W_F = \{p \in \mathbb{P}^n \mid \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F(p) \leq 1\}$$

and

$$V_F = \{p \in \mathbb{P}^n \mid \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F(p) \leq 2\}.$$

Note that if $F \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ is a cubic in reduced form, and $p = [1, 0, \ldots, 0]$, then $p \in V_F$.

Definition 2.9. Let R be a subring of a number field K. Let $F \in R[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ be a non-degenerate cubic form. We say that (a, B, G) is a *reduced form* for F if there exists an element $T \in \mathrm{SL}(n+1, R)$ such that

$$T \cdot F = ax_0^3 + x_0^2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i x_i + G(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \tag{1}$$

where $a \in R$, $B = (b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in R^n$ and $G \in R[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ is a non-degenerate cubic form. For simplicity, we will denote (1) as

$$F = (a, B, G).$$

We say that two reduced forms (a, B, G) and (a', B', G'), are *equivalent over* R if $a = a'$ and there is an element $M \in \mathrm{SL}(n, R)$ such that $B' = M \cdot B$ and $G' = M \cdot G$.

We recall the following well known results:

Proposition 2.10. *Let $\Delta \neq 0$ be an integer. Then there exist*

$$F_1, \ldots, F_k \in \mathbb{Z}[x_0, x_1, x_2]_3 \qquad (\textit{resp. } \mathbb{Z}[x_0, x_1]_3)$$

such that if $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x_0, x_1, x_2]_3$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}[x_0, x_1]_3$) is such that $\Delta_F = \Delta$, then there exists $i = 1, \ldots, k$ and $T \in \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{Z})$ (resp. $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$) such that $F = T \cdot F_i$.

Proof. See [OVdV95, Proposition 7]. □

Theorem 2.11 (Jordan's theorem)**.** *Let $F_i \in \mathbb{Z}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]_3$ be cubic forms with non-zero discriminant with $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ and assume that there exist $M_i \in \mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ such that $F_i = M_i \cdot F_1$ for all i.*

Then there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ there exists $P_i \in \mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{Z})$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $F_i = P_i \cdot F_j$.

Proof. It follows from [OVdV95, Corollary 4 and 5]. □

2.5. **Cubic forms on threefolds.** Let X be a terminal $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective threefold. Let $\underline{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_n)$ be a basis of $\bar{H}^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$. The intersection cup product induces a symmetric trilinear form

$$\phi_X : \bar{H}^2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \otimes \bar{H}^2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \otimes \bar{H}^2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \to H^6(X, \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}.$$

Thus, we may define a cubic homogeneous polynomial $F_X \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ as

$$F_X(x) = \sum_{\substack{I=(i_1,\dots,i_n):\\ i_1+\dots+i_n=3}} \binom{3}{I} \underline{h}^I x^I.$$

We call F_X *the cubic form associated to* X.

As in the smooth case, we have:

Lemma 2.12. *The cubic form F_X is non-degenerate, that is* $\det \mathcal{H}_{F_X}$ *is not identically zero.*

Proof. Let $\Sigma \subseteq X$ be the singular locus of X. Since X is terminal, Σ is a finite set and there exists a resolution $\pi : Y \to X$ with divisorial exceptional locus E such that $Y \setminus E$ is isomorphic to $X \setminus \Sigma$.

Let $\{\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_b\}$ be a basis of $H^2(X, \mathbb{Q})$ and let $B = \{\beta_i = f^*\gamma_i\}$. After completing B to a basis of $H^2(Y, \mathbb{Q})$, we may write

$$F_Y(x_0, \dots, x_n) = F_X(x_0, \dots, x_b) + F(x_{b+1}, \dots, x_n),$$

where we are considering the cubics over $\mathbb{Q}$.

[OVdV95, Proposition 16] implies that $\det \mathcal{H}_{F_Y}$ is not identically zero. Since $\det \mathcal{H}_{F_Y} = \det \mathcal{H}_{F_X} \cdot \det \mathcal{H}_F$, the claim follows. □

Definition 2.13. Let X be a terminal $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective threefold. We define

$$S_X := \sup\{|a| \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \text{there exists } T \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{Z}) \text{ s.t. } T \cdot F_X = (a, b, G)\},$$

where we set $S_X = 0$ if there are no reduced forms for F_X.

Note that S_X is a topological invariant of X since F_X is a topological invariant (modulo the action of $\mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{Z})$).

2.6. **Topology of threefolds.** We now study how the Betti numbers behave under a birational morphism (see [Cai05] for some related results). Note that the singularities of a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial terminal threefold X are in general not analytically $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. In particular, X is in general not a $\mathbb{Q}$-homology manifold (see [Kol89, Lemma 4.2]) and the singular cohomology may differ from the intersection cohomology.

In dimension three, all the Betti numbers behave well under birational transformations except for b_3 (see Lemma 2.17). The behaviour

of the third Betti number is more subtle and depends on the singularities of X and Y as the following example shows:

Example 2.14. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^4$ be a quartic threefold with just one node (rational double point) $p \in X$. It is known that X is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial (e.g. see [Che06]). Locally, the germ (X, p) may be written as

$$\{xy - wz = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^4,$$

which is not analytically $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial. Let $f\colon Y \to X$ be the blow-up of the singularity and let $E \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ be the exceptional divisor. It follows that

$$b_3(Y) = b_3(X) - 1.$$

In particular, the third Betti number may increase under some of the steps of the Minimal Model Program. For this reason, it will be often useful to look at the intersection cohomology instead.

Given a projective variety X, we denote by $IH^i(X, \mathbb{Q})$ the *middle-perversity intersection cohomology group* of dimension i and by Ib_i its dimension. Note that if X is smooth then $IH^i(X, \mathbb{Q})$ coincides with $H^i(X, \mathbb{Q})$ and in particular $Ib_i(X) = b_i(X)$ for all i.

We will use the following consequence of the decomposition theorem for intersection cohomology (see [BBD82]):

Theorem 2.15. *Let $f : Y \to X$ be a proper birational morphism within algebraic varieties. Assume that Y is smooth. Then the cohomology $H^*(Y, \mathbb{Q}) = IH^*(Y, \mathbb{Q})$ of Y contains the intersection cohomology $IH^*(X, \mathbb{Q})$ of X as a direct summand.*

We now restrict our study to the case of threefolds:

Lemma 2.16. *Let $f\colon Y \to X$ be a birational morphism within projective threefolds with terminal singularities. Let E be an exceptional divisor of f and let $W = f(E)$. Assume that f induces an isomorphism $Y \setminus E \to X \setminus W$.*

Then

$$0 \to H^i(X, \mathbb{Q}) \to H^i(Y, \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H^i(W, \mathbb{Q}) \to H^i(E, \mathbb{Q}) \to 0$$

is exact for any $i \geq 4$ and

$$0 \to IH^i(X, \mathbb{Q}) \to IH^i(Y, \mathbb{Q}) \oplus IH^i(W, \mathbb{Q}) \to IH^i(E, \mathbb{Q}) \to 0$$

is exact for any $i \geq 1$.

Proof. From the exact sequence of the pairs we get a long exact sequence in cohomology

$$\cdots \to H^i(X, \mathbb{Q}) \to H^i(Y, \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H^i(W, \mathbb{Q}) \to H^i(E, \mathbb{Q}) \to H^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \to \cdots$$

which by [Del74, Prop. 8.3.9] is an exact sequence of mixed Hodge structure.

Since X, Y have isolated singularities, for $i \geq 4$ the Hodge structure on $H^i(X, \mathbb{Q})$ is pure of weight i (see [Ste83]). On the other hand, since E is projective, $H^k(E, \mathbb{Q})$ has weight at most k for any k ([Del74, Thm. 8.2.4]). Thus, the maps

$$H^i(E, \mathbb{Q}) \to H^{i+1}(X, \mathbb{Q})$$

are zero for $i \geq 3$.

The same argument applies for intersection cohomology with the advantage that the Hodge structure on $IH^i(X, \mathbb{Q})$ is pure of weight i for any i by [Sai88]. □

Lemma 2.17. *Let $f : Y \to X$ be an elementary divisorial contraction within $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective threefolds with terminal singularities.*

Then

(1) $b_0(Y) = b_6(Y) = b_0(X) = b_6(Y) = 1$,
(2) $b_1(Y) = b_1(X)$,
(3) $b_2(Y) = b_2(X) + 1$
(4) $b_4(Y) = b_4(X) + 1$, *and*
(5) $b_5(Y) = b_5(X)$.

Proof. (1) is clear. Lemma 2.16 implies (4) and (5).

We now want to show that $R^1 f_* \mathbb{Z} = 0$. It is enough to show it locally around any point $x \in X$. We consider the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \to f_*\mathbb{Z} \to & f_*\mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{\exp} f_*\mathcal{O}_Y^* \\ & \to R^1 f_*\mathbb{Z} \to R^1 f_*\mathcal{O}_Y \end{aligned}$$

The exponential map is surjective locally around $x \in X$. Since X and Y have rational singularities, it follows that $R^1 f_* \mathcal{O}_Y = 0$. Thus, $R^1 f_* \mathbb{Z} = 0$, as claimed. The Leray spectral sequence implies that $H^1(X, \mathbb{Z}) \to H^1(Y, \mathbb{Z})$ is an isomorphism and, in particular, (2) follows.

Let $H_2(Y/X, \mathbb{C}) \subseteq H_2(Y, \mathbb{C})$ be the subspace generated by all the images of $H_2(F, \mathbb{C})$, where F runs through all the fibres of f. [KM92, Theorem 12.1.3] implies that $H_2(Y/X, \mathbb{C})$ is generated by algebraic cycles and that there exists an exact sequence:

$$0 \to H_2(Y/X, \mathbb{C}) \to H_2(X, \mathbb{C}) \to H_2(Y, \mathbb{Z}) \to 0.$$

Since the relative Picard number is one, it follows that

$$\dim H_2(Y/X, \mathbb{C}) = 1.$$

Thus, (3) follows. □

3. Cubics in reduced form

The aim of this section is to prove the following:

Theorem 3.1. *Let $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ be a non-degenerate cubic form (cf. §2.3) with non-zero discriminant Δ_F.*

Then there are finitely many triples

$$(a_i, B_i, G_i) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_3 \qquad i = 1, \dots, k$$

such that for all $T \in \mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $T \cdot F$ is in reduced form, we have that $T \cdot F$ is equivalent to (a_i, B_i, G_i) over $\mathbb{Z}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ (cf. Definition 2.9).

In addition, we have that $\Delta_{G_i} \neq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Before we proceed with the proof of Theorem 3.1, we first sketch some of its main ideas. Note that if F is in reduced form (a, B, G) then the point $p = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ is contained in the set V_F, defined in §2.4 . Thus, our first goal is to show that the set of points $p \in V_F$ such that $F(p) \neq 0$ is contained in a finite union of points, lines and plane cubics (cf. Theorem 3.5). Assuming furthermore that the discriminant Δ_F of F is not zero, we characterise the cubics F which contain a line (cf. Corollary 3.8) or a plane curves (cf. Corollary 3.9) inside V_F.

The next step is to restrict the cubic to one of the lines or plane curve contained in V_F. To deal with this situation we study binary (cf. Proposition 3.11) and ternary cubics (cf. Proposition 3.14) with non-zero discriminant. The main tool used in the proof of these results is Siegel's theorem on the finiteness of integral points in a curve of positive genus. Finally, we conclude the proof of Theorem 3.1 in §3.3.

3.1. Points of low rank for a cubic form.

We begin by studying the set W_F (cf. §2.4) associated to a non-degenerate cubic form F:

Proposition 3.2. *Let $F \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ be a non-degenerate cubic form. Then W_F is a finite set.*

Proof. Let $W'_F = W_F \cap \{F = 0\}$. We first show that W'_F is a finite set. Assume by contradiction that there exist an irreducible curve C inside W'_F and let $p \in C$. We say that an hyperplane $H \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n$ is *associated* to p if:

(1) $\det \mathcal{H}_F$ vanishes along H,
(2) $p \in H$, and
(3) if $G = F_{|H}$ then $\mathcal{H}_G(p)$ is trivial.

Lemma 2.7 implies that $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F(p) = 1$. After taking a suitable coordinate change, we may assume that $p = [0, \dots, 0, 1]$. In particular

$$F(x_0, \dots, x_n) = x_n^2 \cdot L_1 + x_n \cdot Q_1 + R_1$$

for some homogeneous polynomials $L_1, Q_1, R_1 \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]$ of degree $1, 2$ and 3 respectively. Since $p \in W_F$, it follows that $L_1 = 0$. By assumption, Q_1 is not zero. Using again the fact that $p \in W_F$ it follows that, after taking a suitable coordinate change in $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}$, we may assume that $Q_1 = x_{n-1}^2$. We may write

$$R_1(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = x_{n-1}^2 \cdot L + x_{n-1} \cdot Q + R$$

for some homogeneous polynomials $L \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]$ and $Q, R \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_{n-2}]$ of degree $1, 2$ and 3 respectively. After replacing x_n by $x_n + L$, we may assume that $L = 0$. Thus, we have

$$F(x_0, \dots, x_n) = x_n \cdot x_{n-1}^2 + x_{n-1} \cdot Q + R.$$

Let $H_p = \{x_{n-1} = 0\}$. An easy computation shows that H_p is an hyperplane associated to p. We now show that such an hyperplane is unique. Assume that $H' \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n$ is also an hyperplane associated to p. Since $p \in H'$, we have $H' = \{\ell = 0\}$ for some linear function $\ell \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]$. If $H' \neq H_p$, after a suitable change of coordinates in $x_0, \dots, x_{n-2}$, we may assume that

$$\ell = x_0 - \alpha x_{n-1}$$

for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. Thus if $G' = F_{|H'}$, we may write

$$G'(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_n x_{n-1}^2 + x_{n-1} Q(\alpha x_{n-1}, \dots, x_{n-2}) + R(\alpha x_{n-1}, \dots, x_{n-2})$$

and it follows that

$$\partial_{n-1} \partial_{n-1} G'(p) \neq 0$$

which contradicts (3). Thus, $H' = H_p$ and the claim follows.

Now let $q \in C$ be a point such that $H_p = H_q$. We want to show that $q = p$. If $R = 0$ then if follows easily that $W'_F = \{p\}$. Thus, by Lemma 2.7, after a suitable change in coordinates in $x_0, \dots, x_{n-2}$, we may assume that $R = R(x_0, \dots, x_k)$ for some $k \geq 0$ and that there is no point $z \in \mathbb{P}^k$ such that $\mathcal{H}_R(z)$ is trivial. If $q = [y_0, \dots, y_n]$, it follows by (3) that

$$y_0 = \cdots = y_k = 0.$$

Since $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F(q) = 1$, it follows the that the minor spanned by the i-th and $(n-i)$-th rows and columns of $\mathcal{H}_F(p)$ must have trivial determinant for any $i = 0, \dots, n-2$ and in particular, since $y_{n-1} = 0$ and $\mathcal{H}_R(y_0, \dots, y_{n-2})$ is trivial, it follows that $\partial_i Q(y_0, \dots, y_n) = 0$. It is easy to show that this implies that if $q \neq p$ then $\det \mathcal{H}_R$ vanishes identically, a contradiction.

Since by assumption $\det \mathcal{H}_F$ is a non-trivial function, there exist only finitely many hyperplanes on which $\det \mathcal{H}_F$ vanishes and (1) implies that $H_p = H_q$ for infinitely many pair of points $p, q \in C$, a contradiction. Thus, W'_F is a finite set.

Now let $p \in W_F$ be a point such that $F(p) \neq 0$. After a suitable change of coordinates, we may assume that $p = [0, \ldots, 0, 1]$ and that

$$F(x_0, \ldots, x_n) = x_n^3 + x_n^2 \cdot L + x_n \cdot Q + R$$

for some homogeneous polynomials $L, Q, R \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ of degree 1, 2 and 3 respectively. After replacing x_n by $x_n + \frac{1}{3}L$ we may assume that $L = 0$. Since $p \in W_F$ it follows that $Q = 0$. Let $q = [z_0, \ldots, z_n] \in W_F$. Then either $q = p$ or $z_n = 0$ and $[z_0, \ldots, z_{n-1}] \in W_R$. Thus, the result follows by induction on n. □

Remark 3.3. Note that the same result does not hold under the weaker assumption that $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F(p) \geq 1$ for any $p \in \mathbb{P}^n$ (see Lemma 2.7): e.g. consider

$$F(x_0, \ldots, x_4) = x_4 x_3^2 + x_3 x_1 x_0 + x_2 x_1^2.$$

Then it is easy to check that W_F is not finite.

We now proceed by studying the set V_F (cf. §2.4) associated to a non-degenerate cubic form.

Fix a positive integer n and let ℓ and k be non-negative integers such that $n \geq \ell + 2k + 1$. We will denote:

$$I_{\ell,k} = \{\ell + 2i + 1 \mid i = 0, \ldots, k\} \cup \{\ell + 2k + 2, \ldots, n\}.$$

Given a finite subset $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, we will also denote by $\mathbb{C}[x_I]$ the algebra of polynomials in x_i with $i \in I$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $F \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ be a non-degerate cubic form. Let $C \subseteq V_F$ be a curve such that $F(p) \neq 0$ at the general point of C.*

Then, there exist non-negative integers ℓ, k such that, after a suitable change of coordinates, we may write

$$F = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} G_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k} (x_{\ell+2i+1}^2 + M_i) \cdot x_{\ell+2i} + R_{\ell+k+1}$$

where

(1) $G_i \in \mathbb{C}[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ is a cubic for any $i = 0, \ldots, \ell$ with

$$G_0 = x_0^3 + x_0 x_1^2;$$

(2) $M_i = \delta_i x_{\ell+1}^2$ for any $i = 1, \ldots, k$ with $\delta_i \in \mathbb{C}$;
(3) $R_{\ell+k+1} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{I_{\ell,k}}]$ is a cubic;
(4) $C \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in I_{\ell,k+1}} \{x_i = 0\}$.

Moreover if $C \not\subseteq \{x_{l+2k+2} = 0\}$ *we may write*

$$R_{\ell+k+1} = M_{k+1} \cdot x_{\ell+2k+2} + R_{l+k+2}$$

where

(5) $R_{\ell+k+2} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{I_{\ell,k+1}}]$ *is a cubic and* $M_{k+1} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+3}, \ldots, x_{\ell+2k+1}]$ *is a quadric.*

Proof. We divide the proof in 4 steps:

Step 1. By Proposition 3.2 there exists $p \in C$ such that $F(p) \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F(p) = 2$. Since $F(p) \neq 0$, after a suitable change of coordinates we may assume that $p = [1, 0, \ldots, 0]$ and

$$F = x_0^3 + x_0^2 L + x_0 Q + R$$

for some homogeneous polynomials $L, Q, R \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ of degree 1,2 and 3 respectively. After replacing x_0 by $x_0 - \frac{1}{3}L$ we may assume that $L = 0$. Since $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F(p) = 2$, after a suitable change of coordinates in $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, we may assume that $Q = x_1^2$. Thus, we have

$$F = G_0 + R_1,$$

where $G_0 = x_0^3 + x_0 x_1^2$ and $R_1 = R \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. We distinguish two cases. If C is contained in the hyperplane $\{x_1 = 0\}$, then we set $k = \ell = 0$ and we continue to Step 3. Otherwise, we set $\ell = 1$ and we proceed to Step 2.

Step 2. We are assuming that

$$F = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} G_i + R_\ell$$

where $G_i \in \mathbb{C}[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ and $R_\ell \in \mathbb{C}[x_\ell, \ldots, x_n]$ are cubics, and C is not contained in the hyperplane $\{x_\ell = 0\}$. We claim that after a suitable change of coordinates in $x_\ell, \ldots, x_n$, we may write

$$R_\ell = G_\ell + R_{\ell+1}$$

where $G_\ell \in \mathbb{C}[x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}]$ and $R_{\ell+1} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{\ell+1}, \ldots, x_n]$ are cubics. Assuming the claim, if C is contained in the hyperplane $\{x_{\ell+1} = 0\}$ we set $k = 0$ and we proceed to Step 3. Otherwise, we replace ℓ by $\ell + 1$ and we repeat Step 2.

We now prove the claim. By assumption, there exists $q \in C$ such that $q \notin \{x_\ell = 0\}$. After a suitable change of coordinates in $x_\ell, \ldots, x_n$, we may assume that

$$q = [z_0, \ldots, z_{\ell-1}, 1, 0, \ldots, 0],$$

for some $z_0, \dots, z_{\ell-1} \in \mathbb{C}$. We may write

$$R_\ell = \alpha_\ell x_\ell^3 + L_\ell x_\ell^2 + Q_\ell x_\ell + R_{\ell+1},$$

for some homogeneous polynomials $L_\ell, Q_\ell, R_\ell \in \mathbb{C}[x_{\ell+1}, \dots, x_n]$ of degree 1,2 and 3 respectively. Since $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F(q) \leq 2$, after a suitable change of coordinates, we may write $L_\ell = \beta_\ell x_{\ell+1}$ and $Q_\ell = \gamma_\ell x_{\ell+1}^2$ for some $\beta_\ell, \gamma_\ell \in \mathbb{C}$. We may define

$$G_\ell = \alpha_\ell x_\ell^3 + \beta_\ell x_\ell^2 \cdot x_{\ell+1} + \gamma_\ell x_\ell \cdot x_{\ell+1}^2$$

and the claim follows.

Step 3. We are assuming that

$$F = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} G_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k} (x_{\ell+2i+1}^2 + M_i) \cdot x_{\ell+2i} + R_{\ell+k+1}$$

where G_i, M_i and $R_{\ell+k+1}$ satisfy (1), (2) and (3) and

$$C \subseteq \{x_{\ell+1} = x_{\ell+3} = \cdots = x_{\ell+2k+1} = 0\}.$$

If we also have that

$$C \subseteq \{x_{\ell+2k+2} = \cdots = x_n = 0\}$$

then we are done. In particular, if $n < \ell + 2k + 2$, then we are done. Otherwise, after a suitable change of coordinates in $x_{\ell+2k+2}, \dots, x_n$ we may assume that there exists

$$q = [z_0, \dots, z_n] \in C$$

such that $z_{\ell+2k+2} \neq 0$ and $z_{\ell+2k+3} = \cdots = z_n = 0$. Since

$$\det(\partial_i \partial_j F(p))_{i,j=0,1} \neq 0,$$

we may assume that the same inequality holds for q. We may write

$$R_{\ell+k+1} = \alpha_{\ell+k+1} x_{\ell+2k+2}^3 + x_{\ell+2k+2}^2 \cdot L_{\ell+k+1} + x_{\ell+2k+2} \cdot Q_{\ell+k+1} + R_{\ell+k+2}$$

where $\alpha_{\ell+k+1} \in \mathbb{C}$, and $L_{\ell+k+1}, Q_{\ell+k+1}, R_{\ell+k+2} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{I_{\ell,k+1}}]$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

We first assume that $\alpha_{\ell+k+1} \neq 0$. After replacing $x_{\ell+2k+2}$ by $x_{\ell+2k+2} - \frac{1}{3\alpha_{\ell+k+1}} L_{\ell+k+1}$, we may assume that $L_{\ell+k+1} = 0$. Since $q \in V_F$, we get a contradiction by considering the minor

$$(\partial_i \partial_j F(q))_{i,j=0,1,\ell+2k+2}.$$

We now assume that $\alpha_{\ell+k+1} = 0$. Since $z_{\ell+2k+2} \neq 0$ and $q \in V_F$ it follows that $L_{\ell+k+1} = 0$ and that after a suitable change of coordinates, $Q_{\ell+k+1} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+3}, \dots, x_{\ell+2k+3}]$. We may write

$$Q_{\ell+k+1} = \beta_k x_{\ell+2k+3}^2 + x_{\ell+2k+3} \cdot \ell_k + M_k$$

where $\beta_k \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\ell_k, M_k \in \mathbb{C}[x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+3}, \ldots, x_{\ell+2k+1}]$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree 1 and 2 respectively. If $\beta_k \neq 0$ then, after a suitable change of coordinates, we may assume $\beta_k = 1$ and $\ell_k = 0$. By considering the minor

$$(\partial_i \partial_j F(q))_{i,j=0,\ell+2k+2,\ell+2k+3}$$

it follows that $C \subseteq \{x_{\ell+2k+3} = 0\}$. Thus, we may proceed to Step 4.

If $\beta_k = 0$, then since $q \in V_F$ it follows that $\ell_k = 0$. In case C is contained in $\{x_{\ell+2k+3} = \cdots = x_n = 0\}$ we are done, so we may assume that there exists a point

$$q' = [z'_0, \ldots, z'_n] \in C \cap \bigcap_{i \in J} \{x_i = 0\}$$

such that $z'_0 \neq 0$ and $z'_{\ell+2k+3} \neq 0$, where, $J = I_{\ell,k+1} \setminus \{\ell + 2k + 3\}$. Proceeding as above, we may write

$$R_{\ell+k+2} = x_{\ell+2k+3} \cdot Q_{\ell+k+2} + R_{\ell+k+3},$$

where $Q_{\ell+k+2} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+3}, \ldots, x_{\ell+2k+1}, x_{\ell+2k+4}]$ and $R_{\ell+k+3} \in \mathbb{C}[x_J]$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree 2 and 3 respectively. We may write

$$Q_{\ell+k+2} = \beta_{k+1} x^2_{\ell+2k+4} + x_{\ell+2k+4} \cdot \ell_{k+1} + M_{k+1}$$

where $\beta_{k+1} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\ell_{k+1}, M_{k+1} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+3}, \ldots, x_{\ell+2k+1}]$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree 1 and 2 respectively.

If $\beta_{k+1} = 0$ then $\ell_{k+1} = 0$ because $q' \in V_F$. Denoting by $\mathcal{H}^i_F$ the i-th column of $\mathcal{H}_F$, it follows that the vectors $\mathcal{H}^{\ell+2}_F, \mathcal{H}^{\ell+4}_F \ldots, \mathcal{H}^{\ell+2k+2}_F$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\ell+2k+3}_F$ are linearly dependent. Thus, $\mathcal{H}_F$ does not have maximal rank which contradicts the assumptions.

Hence we have $\beta_{k+1} \neq 0$. After a suitable change of coordinates, we may assume that $\beta_{k+1} = 1$ and $\ell_{k+1} = 0$. By considering the minor

$$(\partial_i \partial_j F(q'))_{i,j=0,\ell+2k+3,\ell+2k+4}$$

it follows that $C \subseteq \{x_{\ell+2k+4} = 0\}$. Thus we first exchange $x_{\ell+2k+3}$ and $x_{\ell+2k+4}$, then we exchange $x_{\ell+2k+2}$ and $x_{\ell+2k+4}$. So we may write

$$R_{\ell+k+1} = x_{\ell+2k+2} \cdot (x^2_{\ell+2k+3} + M_{k+1}) + R_{\ell+k+2}$$

where $M_{k+1} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+3}, \ldots, x_{\ell+2k+1}]$ is a quadric, $R_{\ell+k+2} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{I_{\ell,k+1}}]$ ia a cubic and $C \subseteq \{x_{\ell+2k+3}\}$. We also may write

$$R_{\ell+k+2} = x_{\ell+2k+4} \cdot M_{k+2} + R_{\ell+k+3}$$

where $M_{k+2} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+3}, \ldots, x_{\ell+2k+1}]$, $R_{\ell+k+3} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{I_{\ell,k+2}}]$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree 2 and 3 respectively.

Moreover we have a point

$$q' = [z'_0, \dots, z'_n] \in C \cap \bigcap_{i \in J} \{x_i = 0\}$$

such that $z'_0 \neq 0$ and $z'_{\ell+2k+2} \neq 0$, where $J = I_{\ell,k+1} \setminus \{\ell + 2k + 4\}$. Replacing $x_{\ell+2k+4}$ by $x_{\ell+2k+4} + \frac{z'_{\ell+2k+4}}{z'_{\ell+2k+2}} x_{\ell+2k+2}$ we get a point

$$q = [z_0, \dots, z_n] \in C \cap \bigcap_{i \in I_{l,k+1}} \{x_i = 0\}$$

such that $z_0 \neq 0$, $z_{\ell+2k+2} \neq 0$ and we may proceed to Step 4.

Step 4. We are assuming that

$$F = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} G_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k} (x^2_{\ell+2i+1} + M_i) \cdot x_{\ell+2i} + R_{\ell+k+1}$$

where G_i, M_i and $R_{\ell+k+1}$ satisfy (1), (2) and (3) and

$$C \subseteq \{x_{\ell+1} = x_{\ell+3} = \cdots = x_{\ell+2k+1} = 0\}.$$

By Step 3 we also have that

$$R_{\ell+k+1} = x_{\ell+2k+2} \cdot (x^2_{\ell+2k+3} + M_{k+1}) + R_{\ell+k+2}$$

where $M_{k+1} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+3}, \dots, x_{\ell+2k+1}]$ is homogeneous of degree 2 and $C \subseteq \{x_{\ell+2k+3} = 0\}$. Moreover there is a point $q = [z_0, \dots, z_n]$ such that $z_0 \neq 0$, $z_{\ell+2k+2} \neq 0$ and

$$q \in C \cap \bigcap_{i \in I_{l,k+1}} \{x_i = 0\}.$$

We show that we may assume

$$M_{k+1} = \delta_{k+1} x^2_{\ell+1}$$

where $\delta_k \in \mathbb{C}$.

Since $q \in C$ and $z_{\ell+2k+2} \neq 0$ we have $\det(\partial_i \partial_j F(q))_{i,j=0,1} = 0$. Considering the minors

$$(\partial_i \partial_j F(q))^{i=0,m,\ell+2k+3}_{i=0,h,\ell+2k+3}$$

for $h, m = 1, \dots, n$, $(h, m) \neq (\ell + 2k + 3, \ell + 2k + 3)$ we deduce that $\partial_h \partial_m F(q) = 0$ and so, since by induction $M_i = \delta_i x_{\ell+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots k$, we have

$$M_{k+1} = \sum_{j=0}^{k} \gamma^j_k x^2_{\ell+2j+1},$$

where $\gamma_k^j \in \mathbb{C}$. Since $M_j = \delta_j x_{\ell+1}$ for $j = 1, \dots k$ to conclude it is enough to replace $x_{\ell+2j}$ with $x_{\ell+2j} - \gamma_k^j x_{\ell+2k+2}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$. In this way we get

$$M_{k+1} = \delta_{k+1} x_{\ell+1}^2$$

where $\delta_{k+1} = \gamma_k^0 - \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_k^i \delta_i$.

After replacing k by $k+1$, we may repeat Step 3. □

Theorem 3.5. *Let $F \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ be a non-degenerate cubic.*

Then the set of points $p \in V_F$ such that $F(p) \neq 0$ is a finite union of points, lines, plane conics and plane cubics.

Proof. We may assume that there is an irreducible component $C \subseteq V_F$ such that $\dim C \geq 1$ and $F(p) \neq 0$ at the general point p of C, otherwise we are done. By Theorem 3.4 we may write

$$F = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} G_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k} (x_{\ell+2i+1}^2 + M_i) \cdot x_{\ell+2i} + R_{\ell+k+1}$$

where G_i, M_i and $R_{\ell+k+1}$ are as in Theorem 3.4 and

$$C \subseteq \{x_{\ell+1} = x_{\ell+3} = \cdots = x_{\ell+2k+1} = 0\}.$$

By the proof of Theorem 3.4 we may also assume that for any $i = 1, \dots, k$ there is a point $q_i \in C$ such that $q_i \notin \{x_0 = 0\}$, $q_i \notin \{x_{\ell+2i} = 0\}$ and $q_i \in \bigcap_{j=2i+1}^n \{x_{\ell+j} = 0\}$.

We distinguish two cases: $C \subseteq \{x_1 = 0\}$ and $C \not\subseteq \{x_1 = 0\}$.

If $C \subseteq \{x_1 = 0\}$ then $\ell = 0$. Let $z = [z_0, \dots, z_n] \in C$ be a general point in C.

If $C \subseteq \{x_{2k+2} = 0\}$ then considering

$$(\partial_i \partial_j F(z))_{i=0,1,2k+1}^{j=0,1,2k+1}$$

we immediately get a contradiction because $\det(\partial_i \partial_j F(z))_{i,j=0,1} \neq 0$ and $z_{2k} \neq 0$.

So let $C \not\subseteq \{x_{2k+2} = 0\}$. Then we may write

$$R_{\ell+k+1} = M_{k+1} \cdot x_{\ell+2k+2} + R_{l+k+2}$$

as in (5) of Theorem 3.4. Assume that $k > 2$. Then we have

$$\det(\partial_i \partial_j F)_{i=0,1,2k+1}^{j=0,3,2k+1} =$$

$$= 6x_0 \cdot (2\gamma_{1,3} x_{2k} x_{2k+2} + \gamma_{1,3}\gamma_{2k+1,2k+1} x_{2k+2}^2 - \gamma_{1,2k+1}\gamma_{3,2k+1} x_{2k+2}^2 + Q)$$

where $Q \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a quadratic form such that $C \subseteq \{Q = 0\}$ (because $C \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in I_{\ell,k+1}} \{x_i = 0\}$) and where $\gamma_{i,j}$ is the coefficient of x_{2k+2} in $\partial_i \partial_j F$. Note that $\gamma_{1,3} \neq 0$ (because $\partial_3 \partial_3 F(z) \neq 0$, being this last inequality true for q_2).

Since $z_0 \neq 0$ and $z_{\ell+2k} \neq 0$ we conclude that

$$C \subset \{2\gamma_{1,3}x_{2k} + (\gamma_{1,3}\gamma_{2k+1,2k+1} - \gamma_{1,2k+1}\gamma_{3,2k+1})x_{2k+2} = 0\},$$

which contradicts the fact that $q_k \in C$. Hence we conclude that $k \leq 2$. Now it is easy to see that C is a line or a plane conic.

Assume now that $C \not\subseteq \{x_1 = 0\}$. Then $\ell \geq 1$. Note that for $j = 3, \ldots, n$ we have $\partial_1\partial_j F = 0$, hence for a general point $z = [z_0, \ldots, z_n] \in C$, for $h = 2, \ldots, n$ and for $m = 3, \ldots, n$ we may consider

$$(\partial_i\partial_j F(z))_{i=0,1,h}^{j=0,1,m}$$

to conclude that $\partial_h\partial_m F(z) = 0$ (because $\det(\partial_i\partial_j F(z))_{i,j=0,1} \neq 0$). This implies easily that we may assume $k = 0$. By Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 3.4 for any $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$ there is a point $p_i \in C$ such that $p_i \notin \{x_0 = 0\}$, $p_i \notin \{x_i = 0\}$ and $p_i \in \bigcap_{j=i+1}^{n}\{x_j = 0\}$.

Assume first that $C \subseteq \{x_{\ell+2} = 0\}$ so we may write

$$F = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} G_i + R_{\ell+1}$$

where $G_i \in \mathbb{C}[x_i, x_{i+1}]$, $R_{\ell+1} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{\ell+1}, \ldots, x_n]$ are cubics and $C \subseteq \bigcap_{i=\ell+1}^{n}\{x_i = 0\}$.

Suppose that $\ell > 2$. Since $\partial_3\partial_3 F(p_2) = 0$, $\partial_2\partial_3 F(p_2) = 0$ and $\partial_3\partial_3 F(p_3) = 0$ we see that the monomials $x_2x_3^2$, $x_2^2x_3$ and x_3^3 do not appear in F. The same holds for $x_3x_4^2$ and $x_3^2x_4$ which gives a contradiction. Hence $\ell \leq 2$ and it is easy to conclude.

If $C \not\subseteq \{x_{\ell+2} = 0\}$ then we may write

$$F = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} G_i + x_{\ell+1}^2 \cdot x_{\ell+2} + R_{\ell+1}.$$

where $G_i \in \mathbb{C}[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ and $R_{\ell+1} \in \mathbb{C}[x_{I_{\ell,1}}]$.

Suppose $\ell \geq 2$. Since $\partial_{\ell+1}\partial_{\ell+1}F(p_\ell) = 0$ we see that $x_{\ell+1}^2x_\ell$ does not appear in F and this implies, considering $\partial_{\ell+1}\partial_{\ell+1}F(z)$, that also $x_{\ell+1}^2x_{\ell+2}$ does not appear in F, which is a contradiction. Thus $\ell < 2$ and we are done. □

Remark 3.6. Note that in general V_F might contain surfaces, e.g. if

$$F(x_0, \ldots, x_n) = x_n^3 + x_{n-1}^2x_n + x_{n-1} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} x_i^2$$

then $\dim V_F = n - 2$.

Our goal is now to improve Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 and characterise those cubics F such that V_F contains a curve C such that $C \not\subseteq \{F = 0\}$. To this end, we restrict to the case of cubics with non-zero discriminant.

Corollary 3.7. *Let $F \in \mathbb{C}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ be a non-degenerate cubic such that*

$$F = ax_0^3 + bx_0^2x_1 + G(x_1, \ldots, x_n).$$

Let $C \subseteq V_F$ be positive dimensional irreducible variety such that $p = [1, 0, \ldots, 0] \in C$ and assume that at least one of the following properties holds:

(1) $C \subseteq \{x_1 = 0\}$;
(2) $C \subseteq \{F = 0\}$.

Then $\Delta_F = 0$.

Proof. We first assume that $C \subseteq \{x_1 = 0\}$. By the proof of Theorem 3.5, we may write

$$F = x_0^3 + x_0x_1^2 + (x_3^2 + \delta_1 x_1^2)x_2 + R(x_1, x_3, x_4, \ldots, x_n),$$

for some $\delta_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and $R \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, x_3, x_4, \ldots, x_n]_3$. It follows that the hypersurface $\{F = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n$ is singular at the point $[0, 0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0]$ and in particular $\Delta_F = 0$, as claimed.

We now suppose that $C \subseteq \{F = 0\}$ and $C \not\subseteq \{x_1 = 0\}$. Since $[1, 0, \ldots, 0] \in C$ we may write

$$F = bx_0^2x_1 + c_1x_1^3 + Lx_1^2 + Qx_1 + R$$

where $b, c_1 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $L, Q, R \in \mathbb{C}[x_2, \ldots, x_n]$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree 1,2 and 3 respectively. Since F is non-degenerate, we have that $b \neq 0$.

Acting on $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ we may assume that there exists a point $q = [q_0, q_1, 0, \ldots, 0] \in C$ such that $q_0, q_1 \neq 0$ and that $L = c_2x_2$ for some $c_2 \in \mathbb{C}$. Note that since $C \subseteq \{F = 0\}$, it follows that C is not a line. Furthermore, since $q \in V_F$ we may assume that $Q = c_3x_2^2$ for some $c_3 \in \mathbb{C}$ and we may write

$$F = bx_0^2x_1 + c_1x_1^3 + c_2x_1^2x_2 + c_3x_1x_2^2 + c_4x_2^3 + R_1$$

where $c_4 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $R_1 \in \mathbb{C}[x_2, \ldots, x_n]_3$ is such that the monomial x_2^3 does not appear in R_1. It is easy to see that $\partial_i\partial_j F(z) = 0$ for $i = 2, \ldots, n$, $j = 2, \ldots, n$, with $(i, j) \neq (2, 2)$ and $z \in C$. If $C \subseteq \{x_2 = 0\}$ then, acting on $(x_3, \ldots, x_n)$, we may assume that there is a point $r = [r_0, r_1, 0, r_3, 0, \ldots, 0] \in C$ such that $r_3 \neq 0$. It follows that

$$R_1 = \alpha x_2^2x_3 + R_2(x_2, x_4, \ldots, x_n),$$

for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $R_2 \in \mathbb{C}[x_4, \dots, x_n]_3$. In particular, $[0, 0, 0, 1, 0 \dots, 0]$ is a singular point of $\{F = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n$. Thus, $\Delta_F = 0$, as claimed.

Thus, we may assume that $C \not\subseteq \{x_2 = 0\}$ and that there is a point $s = [s_0, s_1, s_2, 0, \dots, 0]$ such that $s_2 \neq 0$. Since $\partial_i \partial_j F(s) = 0$ for $i = 2, \dots, n$, $j = 2, \dots, n$, with $(i, j) \neq (2, 2)$, it follows that R_1 does not depend on x_2. Thus, $\partial_i \partial_j F(z) = 0$ for any $i, j \geq 3$ and $z \in C$. Lemma 2.7 implies that C is contained in the plane $\Pi = \{x_3 = \dots = x_n = 0\}$. Let F_1 be the restriction of F to Π. Since $C \subseteq \{F = 0\}$, it follows that if $[x_0, x_1, x_2, 0, \dots, 0] \in C$ then $F_1(x_0, x_1, x_2) = 0$ and $\mathcal{H}_{F_1}(x_0, x_1, x_2) = 0$. Thus C is a line, which gives a contradiction. □

Corollary 3.8. *Let*

$$F(x_0, \dots, x_n) = ax_0^3 + x_0^2(bx_1 + cx_2) + G(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

be a non-degenerate cubic form with integral coefficients such that $b \neq 0$. Assume that the line $C = \{x_2 = x_3 = \dots = x_n = 0\}$ is contained inside V_F.

Then there exists $T = (t_{ij})_{i,j=0,\dots,n} \in \mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{Q})$ such that

$$T \cdot F = ax_0^3 + bx_0^2 x_1 + c_1 x_1^3 + R(x_2, \dots, x_n)$$

where $c_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $R \in \mathbb{Q}[x_2, \dots, x_n]$ is a cubic form. Moreover we may choose T such that $t_{00} = t_{11} = 1$, $t_{0i} = t_{i0} = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $t_{ij} = 0$ for $i = 2, \dots, n$ and $j = 1$

Proof. After replacing x_1 by $x_1 - cx_2/b$, we may write

$$F = ax_0^3 + bx_0^2 x_1 + c_1 x_1^3 + Lx_1^2 + Qx_1 + R$$

where $c_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $L, Q, R \in \mathbb{Q}[x_2, \dots, x_n]$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree 1,2 and 3 respectively. Acting on $(x_2, \dots, x_n)$ we may also assume that $L = c_2 x_2$, for some $c_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$. Let $q = [0, 1, 0 \dots, 0] \in C$. We distinguish two cases: $c_1 \neq 0$ and $c_1 = 0$.

If $c_1 \neq 0$ then, since $b \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F(q) \leq 2$, we see that $Q = c_3 x_2^2$ for some $c_3 \in \mathbb{Q}$ and

$$|(\partial_i \partial_j F(q))_{i=1,2}| = 0.$$

It follows that $|(\partial_i \partial_j F(z))_{i=1,2}| = 0$ for any $z \in C$. Since

$$|(\partial_i \partial_j F(z))_{i,j=0,1,2}| = 0,$$

we have that $c_2 = c_3 = 0$. Thus, $L = Q = 0$ and the claim follows.

If $c_1 = 0$ then since $b \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F(q) \leq 2$, it follows that $c_2 = 0$. Since $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}_F(z) \leq 2$ for any $z \in C$, we have $Q = 0$ and, again, the claim follows. Note that in this case, we have $\Delta_F = 0$. □

Corollary 3.9. *Let*

$$F(x_0,\dots,x_n)=ax_0^3+x_0^2(bx_1+cx_3)+G(x_1,\dots,x_n)$$

be a non-degenerate cubic form with integral coefficients with $b,c\in\mathbb{Z}$ *and* $G\in\mathbb{Z}[x_1,\dots,x_n]$ *such that* $b\neq 0$ *and* $\Delta_F\neq 0$. *Let* $C\subseteq V_F$ *be a positive dimensional irreducible variety such that* $C\not\subseteq\{F=0\}$ *and* $p=[1,0,\dots,0]\in C$. *Assume that* C *contains infinitely many rational points. Assume moreover that* $C\subseteq\Pi=\{x_3=\ldots=x_n=0\}$ *and* C *is not a line.*

Then there exists $T=(t_{ij})_{i,j=0,\dots,n}\in \mathrm{SL}(n+1,\mathbb{Q})$, $R\in\mathbb{Z}[x_1,x_2]_3$ *and* $S\in\mathbb{Q}[x_3,\dots,x_n]_3$ *such that:*

(1) $t_{00}=1$, $t_{i0}=t_{0i}=0$ *for* $i=1,\dots,n$, $t_{ij}=0$ *for* $i=3,\dots,n$ *and* $j=1,2$, $(t_{ij})_{i,j=0,1,2}\in\mathrm{SL}(3,\mathbb{Z})$ *and*

(2) $T\cdot F=ax_0^3+bx_0^2x_1+R(x_1,x_2)+S(x_3,\dots,x_n)$.

Proof. We may assume that there is a point $q=[z_0,1,0,\dots,0]\in C$ such that $z_0\neq 0$. Indeed, since C is not a line, there exists $m\in\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\{mx_1+x_2=0\}\cap\Pi$ intersect C in a point $[z_0,1,-m,0,\dots,0]$ with $z_0\neq 0$. After replacing x_2 with x_2+mx_1, we may assume that $m=0$.

In addition, after replacing x_1 with x_1-c/bx_3, we may assume that $c=0$. Thus, we may write

$$F=ax_0^3+bx_0^2x_1+c_1x_1^3+c_2x_1^2x_2+c_3x_1x_2^2+c_4x_2^3+x_1^2L+x_1Q+S$$

where $c_i\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $L\in\mathbb{Q}[x_3,\dots,x_n]$, and $Q,S\in\mathbb{Q}[x_2,\dots,x_n]$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree 1,2 and 3 respectively such that the coefficient of x_2^2 in Q and the coefficient of x_2^3 in S are zero.

If $c_2\neq 0$ then, after replacing x_2 with x_2-L/c_2, we may assume $L=0$. Since $b\neq 0$ and $q\in V_F$, it follows that $Q=0$. Now considering a general point $z\in C\subseteq\{x_3=\ldots=x_n=0\}$, we see that $\partial_i\partial_j S(1,0,\dots,0)=0$ for all $i,j\geq 2$. As in the proof of Lemma 2.7, it follows that S does not depend on x_2. Thus, (2) holds.

Assume now that $c_2=0$ and $L=0$. Then the Hessian of the quadric $c_3x_2^2+Q$ has rank not greater than 1, which means that

$$c_3x_2^2+Q=c_3(x_2+L_1)^2$$

for some $L_1\in\mathbb{Q}[x_3,\cdots,x_n]$ of degree 1. Hence, replacing x_2 with x_2-L_1 we may assume that $Q=0$. As in the previous case, it follows that S does depend on x_2. Thus, (2) holds.

Finally assume that $c_2=0$ and $L\neq 0$. Acting on $(x_3,\dots,x_n)$ with $\mathrm{SL}(n-2,\mathbb{Q})$ we may write $L=\alpha x_3$, where $\alpha\neq 0$. In particular, $\partial_3\partial_1 F(q)\neq 0$. It follows that the first two columns $\mathcal{H}_F^0(q)$ and $\mathcal{H}_F^1(q)$ of $\mathcal{H}_F(q)$ are linearly independent, which implies that $c_3=0$. Considering

now a general point in $C \subseteq \{x_3 = \cdots = x_n = 0\}$, we see that $c_4 = 0$. and that the only monomial which appears in $x_1 Q + S$ with non-zero coefficient and which contains x_2 is $x_2 x_3^2$. Since $[0, 0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0]$ is a singular point of the hypersurface $\{F = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n$, it follows that $\Delta_F = 0$, a contradiction. □

3.2. **Binary and ternary cubics.** We now study the possible reduced forms of a non-degenerate binary or ternary cubic. We show that if F is a binary cubic, it admits only finitely many non-equivalent reduced forms (cf. Proposition 3.11). On the other hand, if F is a ternary cubic, then the same result holds with the extra assumption that the discriminant Δ_F is non-zero (cf. Proposition 3.14). Example 3.15 shows that this assumption is necessary.

We begin with the following:

Lemma 3.10. *Let*

$$F(x, y) = ax^3 + bx^2 y + cy^3 \in R_W[x, y]$$

be a binary cubic on a ring of integers R_W such that $c \neq 0$.

Then there are finitely many pairs

$$(a_i, b_i) \in R_W \times R_W \qquad i = 1, \ldots, k$$

such that for all $T \in \mathrm{SL}(2, R_W)$ such that $T \cdot F$ is in reduced form (a', b', cy^3), we have that $T \cdot F = (a_i, b_i, cy^3)$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.

Proof. Assume that $T = (t_{i,j})_{ij=0,1} \in \mathrm{SL}(2, R_W)$ is such that $T \cdot F$ is in reduced form (a', b', cy^3), for some $a', b' \in R_W$.

Note that $F(t_{01}, t_{11}) = c$ and, since $c \neq 0$, the equation $F(x, y) = c$ defines a smooth affine plane curve of genus 1. Thus, by Siegel's Theorem 2.8, it only admits finitely many solutions. Thus, we may assume that t_{01} and t_{11} are fixed. Since $\det T = 1$ and since the coefficient of xy^2 is zero, we get the linear system in t_{00} and t_{10}:

$$\begin{cases} 1 = & t_{11} t_{00} - t_{01} t_{10} \\ 0 = & (3at_{01}^2 \ + 2bt_{01} t_{11}) t_{00} + (bt_{01}^2 + 3ct_{11}^2) t_{10}. \end{cases}$$

Note that the determinant of the system is equal to $3F(t_{01}, t_{11}) = 3c \neq 0$. Thus, the system admits exactly one solution and the claim follows. □

Proposition 3.11. *Let*

$$F(x, y) = ax^3 + bx^2 y + cy^3 \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$$

be a binary integral cubic with $c \neq 0$.

Then there are finitely many triples

$$(a_i, b_i, c_i) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \qquad i = 1, \dots, k$$

such that $c_i \neq 0$ *and for all* $T \in \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{Z})$ *such that* $T \cdot F$ *is in reduced form, we have that* $T \cdot F = (a_i, b_i, c_i y^3)$ *for some* $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.10, it is enough to show that there are only finitely many $c_1, \dots, c_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that if $T \in \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{Z})$ is such that $T \cdot F$ is in reduced form $(a', b', c'y^3)$, with $c' \neq 0$, then $c' = c_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

If the discriminant $\Delta_F = 4b^3c + 27a^2c^2$ of F is not zero, then $c' | \Delta_F$ and the claim follows.

Thus, we may assume that $\Delta_F = 0$. We may also assume that a, b and c do not have a common factor, otherwise we just consider the cubic obtained by dividing by the common factor. Suppose that $T = (t_{ij})_{i,j=0,1}$. Then,

$$a = a' t_{00}^3 + b' t_{00}^2 t_{10} + c' t_{10}^3, \tag{2}$$

$$b = 3a' t_{00}^2 t_{01} + b' t_{00}^2 t_{11} + 2b' t_{00} t_{01} t_{10} + 3c' t_{10}^2 t_{11}, \tag{3}$$

$$0 = 3a' t_{00} t_{01}^2 + b' t_{01}^2 t_{10} + 2b' t_{00} t_{01} t_{11} + 3c' t_{10} t_{11}^2, \tag{4}$$

$$c = a' t_{01}^3 + b' t_{01}^2 t_{11} + c' t_{11}^3 \tag{5}$$

and $GCD(a', b', c') = 1$.

Let p be a prime factor of c' such that $p \neq 2, 3$ and let α be a positive integer such that $p^\alpha | c'$. Then, since $D = 0$, it follows that $p^{\lceil \alpha/3 \rceil}$ divides b'. By (4), and since $\gcd(t_{00}, t_{01}) = 1$, we have that either $p^{\lceil \alpha/3 \rceil}$ divides t_{00} or $p^{\lceil \alpha/6 \rceil}$ divides t_{01}. In the first case, (2) implies that p^α divides a, and in the second case, (5) implies that $p^{\lceil \alpha/2 \rceil}$ divides c . Since $a, c \neq 0$ are fixed, it follows that p^α is bounded. A similar argument holds for the powers of 2 and 3. Hence c' is bounded, as claimed. □

We now pass to the study of ternary cubics.

Proposition 3.12. *Let* R *be a ring which is finitely generated over* $\mathbb{Z}$ *and let* $F \in R[x, y, z]$ *be a cubic form with non-zero discriminant* Δ_F. *Let* $G(y, z) = dy^3 + z^3$ *for some non-zero* $d \in R$.

Then there are finitely many pairs

$$(a_i, (b_i, c_i)) \in R \times R^2 \qquad i = 1, \dots, k$$

such that for all $T \in \mathrm{SL}(3, R)$ *such that* $T \cdot F$ *is in reduced form* $(a, (b, c), G)$ *for some* $a, b, c \in R$ *, we have that* $T \cdot F = (a_i, (b_i, c_i), G)$ *for some* $i =\in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Proof. Assume that $T \in \mathrm{SL}(3, R)$ is such that $T \cdot F$ is in reduced form $(a, (b, c), G)$. Then, it is easy to compute the invariants S_F and T_F:

$$S_F = dbc \quad \text{and} \quad T_F = 27a^2d^2 + 4b^3d + 4c^3d^2.$$

We first assume that $S_F \neq 0$ and we consider the curve $C \subseteq \mathbb{P}^3$ given by the ideal

$$I = (S_F x_3^2 - dx_1x_2, T_F x_3^3 - 27d^2x_0^2x_3 - 4dx_1^3 - 4d^2x_2^3).$$

We claim that the points $[a, b, c, 1] \in C$, with $a, b, c \in R$ are in finite number and hence the claim follows.

Note that the first equation define a cone over a conic with vertex the point $q = [1, 0, 0, 0] \in C$. If we blow-up the point q, then it is easy to check the strict transform $\tilde{C}$ of the curve C is a connected smooth curve of genus 3. Thus, the claim follows by Siegel's Theorem 2.8.

We now assume that $S_F = 0$. Then, $b = 0$ or $c = 0$. Assume that $c = 0$. Then the pair (a, b) corresponds to a R_W-integral point in the affine plane curve, defined by the equation

$$27x_0^2d^2 + 4x_1^3d - T_F = 0.$$

Since, by assumption $\Delta_F \neq 0$, we have that $T_F \neq 0$. Thus, Siegel's Theorem 2.8 implies the claim. The case $b = 0$ is similar. □

Remark 3.13. Note that if $F \in R[x, y, z]$ is a cubic such that $\Delta_F = 0$ and $S_F = 0$, and C is the curve defined in the proof of Proposition 3.12, then C is a rational curve.

As a consequence of the previous result we obtain the following:

Proposition 3.14. *Let $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y, z]$ be a cubic form with non-zero discriminant Δ_F.*

Then there are finitely many triples

$$(a_i, B_i, G_i) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}[x, y, z]_3 \qquad i = 1, \ldots, k$$

such that for all $T \in \mathrm{SL}(3, Z)$ such that $T \cdot F$ is in reduced form, we have that $T \cdot F$ is equivalent to (a_i, B_i, G_i) over $\mathbb{Z}$, for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.

Proof. Let $T \in \mathrm{SL}(3, Z)$ such that $T \cdot F$ is in reduced form (a, B, G) for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $B \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $G \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y, z]$ cubic form. Lemma 2.6 implies that Δ_G divides Δ_F. Thus, $\Delta_G \neq 0$ and we may assume that its value is fixed, and, by Proposition 2.10, we may assume that G is also fixed, up to the action of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$.

Let $d = \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_F}{27}}$. After possibly replacing the ring of integers $\mathbb{Z}$ by a finitely generated ring R over $\mathbb{Z}$, we may assume, up to a $\mathrm{SL}(2, R)$-action, that

$$G(y, z) = dy^3 + z^3.$$

Thus, the claim follows from Proposition 3.12. □

Note that Proposition 3.12 does not hold if the discriminant of F is zero, as the following example shows:

Example 3.15. Let

$$F = ax^3 + bx^2y + x^2z - 3y^2z$$

where $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that $\Delta_F = 0$, since $[0, 0, 1]$ is a singular point for $\{F = 0\}$. Consider the Pell's equation

$$s^2 - 3t^2 = 1. \tag{6}$$

For any solution $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ of (6), we define the matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 3\beta & 0 \\ \beta & \alpha & 0 \\ m_{31} & m_{32} & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $m_{31} = \beta(3b\beta^2 + 9a\alpha\beta + 2b\alpha^2)$ and $m_{32} = 3\beta^2(3a\beta + b\alpha)$.

Then $M \in \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{Z})$ and

$$M \cdot F(X, Y, X) = AX^3 + BX^2Y + X^2Z - 3Y^2Z.$$

where

$$A = 3b\alpha^2\beta + 3b\beta^3 + a\alpha^3 + 9a\alpha\beta^2 \text{ and } B = 9a\beta^3 + 9b\alpha\beta^2 + 9a\alpha^2\beta + b\alpha^3.$$

Since (6) has infinitely many integral solutions, it follows that there are infinitely many ways to write F in reduced form.

In the example above, $\{F = 0\}$ defines an irreducible cubic with a node. Note that such cubics can be realised as the cubic form associated to a smooth threefold (the existence of such a threefold was asked in [OVdV95, Proposition 21]):

Example 3.16. Let $W = \mathbb{P}^3$, h the hyperplane class and C a line. Note that $\deg N_{C/W} = 2$. Let $\pi : X \to W$ be the blow-up of W along C and define $H = \pi^*h$. Let $\{L_1, L_2\}$ be the basis of $H^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ given by

$$L_1 = H \quad \text{and } L_2 = H - E$$

where E is the exceptional divisor of π. The intersection cubic form on $H^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ is

$$G(y, z) = (yL_1 + zL_2)^3 = y^3 + 3y^2z.$$

Let $C' \subseteq \mathbb{P}^3$ be a line which meets C transversally in one point and let D be the strict transform of C' in X. Then $D \equiv H^2 - H \cdot E$ and blowing-up X along D we get a threefold Y with associated cubic form

$$F(x, y, z) = x^3 - 3(y + z)x^2 + y^3 + 3y^2z.$$

Note that $\{F = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ defines an irreducible cubic with a node and in particular $\Delta_F = 0$.

3.3. **General cubics.** We now combine the previous results to give a proof of Theorem 3.1. We begin with the following:

Lemma 3.17. *Let $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ be a non-degenerate cubic and let $p \in V_F$ such that $F(p) \neq 0$.*

Then there are finitely many triples

$$(a_i, B_i, G_i) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]_3 \qquad i = 1, \ldots, k$$

such that for all $T \in \mathrm{SL}(n + 1, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $T \cdot p = [1, 0, \ldots, 0]$ and $T \cdot F$ is in reduced form, we have that $T \cdot F$ is equivalent to (a_i, B_i, G_i) over $\mathbb{Z}$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.

Proof. We may assume that $p = [1, 0, \ldots, 0]$ and that $F = (a, b, G)$ is in reduced form, for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $B \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $G \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]_3$. We consider all the matrices $T \in \mathrm{SL}(n + 1, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $T \cdot p = p$ and $T \cdot F = (a_T, b_T, G_T)$ is in reduced form, for some $a_T \in \mathbb{Z}$, $B_T \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $G_T \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$.

If we write $T = (t_{ij})_{i,j=0,\ldots,n}$ with $t_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$, then, since $T \cdot p = p$, we have $t_{i0} = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Thus, $t_{00} = \pm 1$ and in particular $a_T = \pm a$.

By considering the action of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ over $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, we may assume that $B = (b_1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ and that, for each T, $B_T = (b_1^T, 0 \ldots, 0)$, with $b_1, b_1^T \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that, by the assumption on F, we have that a and b_1 cannot be both zero.

By looking at the coefficients of $x_0^2 x_i$ and $x_0 x_i^2$, we obtain the equations

$$\begin{aligned} &3at_{0i} + b_1 t_{1i} = 0 \qquad \text{for } i = 2, \ldots, n \text{ and} \\ &3at_{0i}^2 + 2b_1 t_{0i} t_{1i} = 0 \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

We now consider three cases.

If $b_1 = 0$ then $a \neq 0$ and (7) implies that $t_{0i} = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. In particular, $T \cdot F$ is equivalent to F.

If $a = 0$ then $b_1 \neq 0$ and (7) implies that $t_{1i} = 0$ for $i = 2, \ldots, n$. In particular, $t_{11} = \pm 1$. By looking at the coefficients of $x_0 x_1 x_i$ for

$i = 1, \dots, n$, we get the equations

$$b_1 t_{0i} t_{11} = 0.$$

Thus $t_{0i} = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and, as in the previous case, we obtain that $T \cdot F$ is equivalent to F.

Finally if $a, b \neq 0$ then (7) implies that $t_{0i} = t_{1i} = 0$ for $i = 2, \dots, n$. In particular, $t_{11} = \pm 1$. By (7), it follows that t_{01} can only acquire finitely many values. Thus, under these assumptions on T, it follows that there are only finitely many non-equivalent reduced form $T \cdot F$ over $\mathbb{Z}$, as claimed. □

In the next Lemma we show that under the action of the transformations given by Corollaries 3.8 and 3.9 we may control the last part of a reduced form.

Lemma 3.18. *Let $s \in \{1, 2\}$ and let $F, F_1 \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ be non-degenerate cubic forms such that*

$$F = ax_0^3 + bx_0^2 x_1 + R(x_1, x_s) + H(x_{s+1}, \dots, x_n)$$

and

$$F_1 = a_1 x_0^3 + b_1 x_0^2 x_1 + R_1(x_1, x_s) + H_1(x_{s+1}, \dots, x_n)$$

where $b, b_1 \neq 0$ and R, R_1, H, H_1 are cubic forms.

Assume that there exists $T = (t_{hk})_{h,k=0,\dots,n} \in \mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{Q})$ such that $T \cdot F = F_1$, $t_{hk} = 0$ for $h = s+1, \dots, n$ and $k = 0, \dots, s$ and $\det(t_{hk})_{h,k=0,\dots,s} = 1$.

Then there exists $P \in \mathrm{SL}(n-s, \mathbb{Q})$ such that $P \cdot H = H_1$.

Proof. We prove the case $s = 2$, the case $s = 1$ is similar and easier.

We will show that $t_{hk} = 0$ for $h = 0, 1, 2$ and $k = 3, \dots, n$, which implies the claim.

Let $S = (t_{hk})_{h,k=0,1,2}$ and let $\overline{T} = (\overline{t_{hk}})_{h,k=0,\dots,n} \in \mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{Q})$ defined by

$$(\overline{t_{hk}})_{h,k=0,1,2} = S^{-1} \quad (\overline{t_{hk}})_{h,k=3,\dots,n} = I_{n-2},$$
$$(\overline{t_{hk}})_{h=3,\dots,n}^{k=0,1,2} = 0, \quad (\overline{t_{hk}})_{h=0,1,2}^{k=3,\dots,n} = 0$$

where $I_{n-2} \in \mathrm{SL}(n-2, \mathbb{Q})$ is the identity matrix.

If $M = (m_{ij})_{i,j=0,\dots,n} = \overline{T} \cdot T$ and $\overline{F_1} = M \cdot F$, then $\overline{F_1}$ is in reduced form with associated triple $(a, (b, 0), R + H_1)$. In addition

$$(m_{hk})_{h,k=0,1,2} = I_3 \quad (m_{hk})_{h=3,\dots,n}^{k=0,1,2} = 0.$$

We want to show that $m_{hk} = 0$ for $h = 0, 1, 2$ and $k = 3, \dots, n$. Since S is invertible, it follows that $t_{hk} = 0$ for $h = 0, 1, 2$ and $k = 3, \dots, n$, as claimed.

We assume first that $a \neq 0$. Recall that, by assumption, we have $b \neq 0$. For any $k = 3, \ldots, n$, looking at the coefficients of the monomials $x_0 x_k^2$ and $x_0^2 x_k$ in $\overline{F_1}$, we obtain the equations

$$3am_{0k} + bm_{1k} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 3am_{0k}^2 + 2bm_{0k}m_{1k} = 0$$

which imply that $m_{0k} = m_{1k} = 0$ for any $k = 3, \ldots, n$.

We may write

$$R(x_1, x_2) = c_1 x_1^3 + c_2 x_1^2 x_2 + c_3 x_1 x_2^2 + c_4 x_2^3.$$

for some $c_1, \ldots, c_4 \in \mathbb{Q}$. Looking at the coefficients of the monomials $x_1^2 x_k$, $x_1 x_k^2$ and $x_2^2 x_k$ in $\overline{F_1}$ we see that:

$$c_2 m_{2k} = 0 \quad c_3 m_{2k}^2 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad c_4 m_{2k} = 0.$$

Since F is a non-degenerate cubic, it follows that $m_{2k} = 0$ for $k = 3, \ldots, n$. Thus, the claim follows.

Assume now that $a = 0$. Then, looking at the coefficients of $x_0 x_k^2$ and $x_0 x_1 x_k$, we obtain $m_{0k} = m_{1k} = 0$ for $k = 3, \ldots, n$. Thus, as in the previous case, the claim follows. □

Proposition 3.19. *Let $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$ be a non-degenerate cubic in reduced form:*

$$F(x_0, \ldots, x_n) = ax_0^3 + bx_0^2 x_1 + G(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$$

where $G \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]_3$. Assume that $\Delta_F \neq 0$. Let $C \subseteq V_F$ be an irreducible component of positive dimension such that

$$p = [1, 0, \ldots, 0] \in C, \quad C \not\subseteq \{F = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad C \not\subseteq \{x_1 = 0\}.$$

Then there are finitely many triples

$$(a_i, b_i, G_i) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]_3 \qquad i = 1, \ldots, k$$

such that for all $T \in \mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $[1, 0, \ldots, 0] \in T(C)$ and $T \cdot F$ is in reduced form, we have that $T \cdot F$ is equivalent to $(a_i, (b_i, 0), G_i)$ over $\mathbb{Z}$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.

Proof. Suppose not. Then there exist an infinite sequence $T_i \in \mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{Z})$ with $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ such that $[1, 0, \ldots, 0] \in T_i(C)$, $T_i \cdot F$ is in reduced form and $T_i \cdot F$ and $T_j \cdot F$ are not equivalent over $\mathbb{Z}$ for any $i \neq j$.

Lemma 3.17 implies that the set $\{T_i^{-1}([1, 0, \ldots, 0])\}$ is infinite. In particular, C admits infinitely many rational points. By Proposition 3.2, we have that $b \neq 0$, as otherwise $p \in W_F$.

We first assume that C is a line. After acting on $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ with $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$, we may assume that $C = \{x_2 = x_3 = x_4 = \ldots = x_n = 0\}$ and we may write

$$F = ax_0^3 + (bx_1 + cx_2)x_0^2 + G(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$$

where $b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$, $b \neq 0$ and $G \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ is a cubic. Since reduced forms are considered modulo the action of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ on $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, we may assume that for any $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, the cubic $F_i = T_i \cdot F$ satisfies the same property, that is

$$F_i = a_i x_0^3 + (b_i x_1 + c_i x_2)x_0^2 + G_i(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$$

where $b_i, c_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ are such that $b_i \neq 0$, $G_i \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]_3$ and $T_i(C) = \{x_2 = x_3 = x_4 = \ldots = x_n = 0\}$.

Fix i and let $T_i = (t_{hk})_{h,k=0,\ldots,n}$. Since $\{x_2 = x_3 = x_4 = \ldots = x_n = 0\}$ is fixed by T_i we have $t_{hk} = 0$ for $h = 2, \ldots, n$ and $k = 0, 1$. Since $\det T_i = 1$, we may assume $\det(t_{h,k})_{h,k=0,1} = 1$.

We may find $M, M_i \in \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Q})$ as in Corollary 3.8, such that

$$\hat{F} = M \cdot F = ax_0^3 + bx_0^2 x_1 + dx_1^3 + H(x_2, \ldots, x_n)$$

and

$$\hat{F}_i = M_i \cdot F_i = a_i x_0^3 + b_i x_0^2 x_1 + d_i x_1^3 + H_i(x_2, \ldots, x_n)$$

where $d, d_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $H, H_i \in \mathbb{Q}[x_2, \ldots, x_n]$ are cubic forms.

In addition, if $\hat{T}_i = (\hat{t}_{hk})_{h,k=0,\ldots,n} = M_i \cdot T_i \cdot M^{-1}$, we have that $\hat{T}_i \cdot \hat{F} = \hat{F}_i$. Let

$$U_i := (\hat{t}_{hk})_{h,k=0,1}.$$

Note that, by Corollary 3.8, it follows that $\hat{t}_{hk} = 0$ for $h = 2, \ldots, n$ and $k = 0, 1$ and $U_i \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$. Let

$$F' = \hat{F}_{|C} = ax_0^3 + bx_0^2 x_1 + dx_1^3 \text{ and } F_i' = \hat{F}_{i|C} = a_i x_0^3 + b_i x_0^2 x_1 + d_i x_1^3.$$

Then $F', F_i' \in \mathbb{Z}[x_0, x_1]$ are binary cubics such that $U_i \cdot F' = F_i'$. In particular $\Delta_{F'} = \Delta_{F_i'} \neq 0$ as otherwise the hypersurface $\{\hat{F} = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n$ would be singular and $\Delta_F = \Delta_{\hat{F}} = 0$, which contradicts the assumption on F. Thus, by Proposition 3.11 we may assume that

$$a_i = a \quad b_i = b \quad \text{and} \quad d_i = d \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.18, for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ there exists $P_i \in \mathrm{SL}(n-1, \mathbb{Q})$ such that $H_i = P_i \cdot H$. Since the hyperplane $\{x_0 = 0\}$ is invariant with respect to M_i, there exist $M, M_i' \in \mathrm{SL}(m, \mathbb{Q})$ such that if

$$H'(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = dx_1^3 + H(x_2, \ldots, x_n)$$

and

$$H_i'(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = dx_1^3 + H_i(x_2, \ldots, x_n),$$

then $M' \cdot G = H'$ and $M'_i \cdot G = H'_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$. Thus, there exist $P'_i \in \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Q})$ such that $G_i = P'_i \cdot G$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots$. By Jordan's theorem 2.11, it follows that, after possibly taking a subsequence, the reduced forms $F_1, F_2, \ldots$ are equivalent over $\mathbb{Z}$. Thus, we obtain a contradiction.

Assume now that C is not a line. Theorem 3.5 implies that C spans a plane Π. After acting on $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ with $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$, we may assume $\Pi = \{x_3 = x_4 = \ldots = x_n = 0\}$ and we may write

$$F = ax_0^3 + x_0^2(bx_1 + cx_3) + G(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$$

where $b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$, $b \neq 0$ and $G \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ is a cubic.

Since reduced forms are considered modulo the action of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ on $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, we may assume that this holds for any $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, the cubic $F_i = T_i \cdot F$ satisfies the same property, that is

$$F_i = a_i x_0^3 + x_0^2(b_i x_1 + c_i x_3) + G_i(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$$

where $b_i, c_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ are such that $b_i \neq 0$, $G_i \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]_3$ and $T_i(C) \subseteq \Pi = \{x_3 = x_4 = \ldots = x_n = 0\}$.

Fix $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ and let $T_i = (t_{hk})_{h,k=0,\ldots,n}$. Since $\Pi = \{x_3 = \ldots = x_n = 0\}$ is fixed by T_i we have $t_{hk} = 0$ for $h = 3, \ldots, n$ and $k = 0, 1, 2$. Since $\det T_i = 1$, we may assume $\det(t_{h,k})_{h,k=0,1,2} = 1$.

By Corollary 3.9, we may find $M, M_i \in \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Q})$ such that

$$\hat{F} = M \cdot F = ax_0^3 + bx_0^2 x_1 + R(x_1, x_2) + H(x_3, \ldots, x_n)$$

and

$$\hat{F}_i = M_i \cdot F_i = a_i x_0^3 + b_i x_0^2 x_1 + R_i(x_1, x_2) + H_i(x_3, \ldots, x_n)$$

where $R, R_i \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, x_2]$ and $H, H_i \in \mathbb{Q}[x_3, \ldots, x_n]$ are cubic forms. In addition, if $\hat{T}_i = (\hat{t}_{hk})_{h,k=0,\ldots,n} = M_i \cdot T_i \cdot M^{-1}$, we have that $\hat{T}_i \cdot \hat{F} = \hat{F}_i$. Let

$$U_i := (\hat{t}_{hk})_{h,k=0,1,2}.$$

Note that, by Corollary 3.9, it follows that $\hat{t}_{hk} = 0$ for $h = 3, \ldots, n$ and $k = 0, 1, 2$ and $U_i \in \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{Z})$. Let

$$F' = \hat{F}_{|\Pi} = ax_0^3 + bx_0^2 x_1 + R(x_1, x_2) \text{ and } F_i' = \hat{F}_{i|\Pi} = a_i x_0^3 + b_i x_0^2 x_1 + R_i(x_1, x_2).$$

Then $F', F_i \in \mathbb{Z}[x_0, x_1, x_2]$ are ternary cubics such that $U_i \cdot F' = F'_i$. In particular $\Delta_{F'} = \Delta_{F'_i} \neq 0$, as otherwise the hypersurface $\{\hat{F} = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n$ would be singular and $\Delta_F = \Delta_{\hat{F}} = 0$, which contradicts the assumption on F. Thus, by Proposition 3.14 we may assume that a_i, b_i and R_i do not depend on $i = 1, 2, \ldots$.

As in the previous case, we obtain that, after possibly taking a subsequence, $F_1, F_2, \ldots$ are equivalent over $\mathbb{Z}$, a contradiction. $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.1:

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We may assume that F is in reduced form

$$F = ax_0^3 + bx_0^2x_1 + G$$

where $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $G \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_3$.

We assume that there exist $T_i \in \mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{Z})$, with $i = 1, 2, \dots$ such that $F_i = T_i \cdot F$ is in reduced form (a_i, B_i, G_i) for some $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $B_i \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $G_i \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_3$ and F_i and F_j are not equivalent over $\mathbb{Z}$ for any $i \neq j$. Acting on $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ with $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ we may assume that $B_i = (b_i, 0 \dots, 0)$, for some $b_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $p = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$ and let $C_1, \dots, C_k \subseteq V_F$ be all the irreducible components. Then, after possibly replacing p by $T_j(p)$ for some j, we may assume that $p, T_i(p) \in C = C_1$ for all i (possibly passing to an infinite subsequence). Lemma 3.17 implies that C is of positive dimension.

Since by assumption $\Delta_F \neq 0$, Corollary 3.7 implies that

$$C \not\subseteq \{x_1 = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad C \not\subseteq \{F = 0\}.$$

Thus, Proposition 3.19 implies a contradiction. □

We conclude the section proving a finiteness result on a special class of reduced forms. The result will be used in §4.2.

Proposition 3.20. *Let $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ be a non-degenerate cubic such that $\Delta_F \neq 0$. Fix an integer $r \neq 0$. Then there are finitely many pairs*

$$(a_i, G_i) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_3 \qquad i = 1, \dots, k$$

such that for all $T \in \mathrm{GL}(n+1, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $\det T = r$ and $T \cdot F$ is in reduced form, we have that $T \cdot F$ is equivalent to $(a_i, 0, G_i)$ over $\mathbb{Z}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Moreover $\Delta_{G_i} \neq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$

Proof. Suppose not. Then there exist infinitely many $T_1, T_2, \dots \in \mathrm{GL}(n+1, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $\det T_i = r$, $T_i \cdot F = (a_i, 0, G_i)$ is in reduced form for each i and T_i and T_j are not equivalent over $\mathbb{Z}$ for each $i \neq j$. We denote $S_{i,j} = T_i^{-1}T_j$. Note that $T_i([1, 0, \dots, 0]) \in W_F$ for all i. Thus, by Proposition 3.2 we may assume that $[1, 0, \dots, 0]$ is fixed by $S_{i,j}$ for each i, j. It follows easily that if $S_{i,j} = (s_{hk})$ then $s_{h0} = s_{0k} = 0$ for any $h, k = 1, \dots, n$.

Since $\det T_i = r$, it follows that the denominators of the coefficients of $S_{i,j}$ are bounded and since $\det S_{i,j} = 1$, it follows that $s_{0,0}$ is bounded and in particular there exist $i \neq j$ such that $T_i \cdot F$ is equivalent to $T_j \cdot F$ over $\mathbb{Z}$.

Finally, Lemma 2.6 implies that, for each i we have $\Delta_{G_i} \neq 0$. □

4. Proof of the main results

4.1. **Bounding the volume.** Let X be a smooth projective threefold of general type. In this section we prove that the volume of X (cf. definition 2.1) is bounded by a constant which depends only on the topological Betti numbers of X.

Theorem 4.1. *Let X be a smooth projective threefold. Then*

$$\operatorname{vol}(X, K_X) \leq 72 \left(b_1(X) + b_3(X) + \frac{1}{12} b_2(X) \right).$$

Proof. We may assume that X is of general type, as otherwise $\operatorname{vol}(X) = 0$. Let $X \dashrightarrow Y$ be a minimal model of X. Then Y has only terminal singularities, and in particular it is smooth outside a finite number of points. In addition,

$$\operatorname{vol}(X, K_X) = \operatorname{vol}(Y, K_Y) = K_Y^3.$$

Theorem 2.5 implies that

$$\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) = \frac{1}{24}(-K_Y \cdot c_2(Y) + e)$$

where

$$e = \sum_{p_\alpha} \left(r(p_\alpha) - \frac{1}{r(p_\alpha)} \right),$$

and the sum runs over all the points of all the baskets $\mathcal{B}(Y, p)$ of singularities of Y. Note that $e \leq \Xi(Y)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{vol}(X, K_X) = K_Y^3 &\leq 3K_Y \cdot c_2(Y) \\ &= 3(-24\chi(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) + e) \\ &= 3(24 \sum_{i=0}^{3} (-1)^{i+1} h^i(X, \mathcal{O}_X) + e) \\ &\leq 3(24 b_1(X) + 24 b_3(X) + \Xi(Y)), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Theorem 2.4.

Thus, Proposition 2.3 implies the claim. □

An immediate application of Theorem 4.1 is the following:

Corollary 4.2. *The volume only takes finitely many values on the set of three dimensional projective varieties with a fixed underlying 6-manifold.*

Proof. Let X be a smooth projective threefold. The volume $\operatorname{vol}(X, K_X)$ is a rational number whose denominator is bounded by the cube of the

index of a minimal model of X. Thus, the claim follows immediately from Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 4.1. □

4.2. **Divisorial contractions.** Let Y be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective threefold and let $f\colon Y \to X$ be an elementary K_Y-negative birational contraction. By Lemma 2.17, we have that $b_2(Y) - b_2(X) = 1$. Let $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_b\}$ be a basis of $\bar{H}^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ and let $\beta_i = f^*\gamma_i$.

If f is a divisorial contraction, then we have a natural choice for a class $\alpha \in \bar{H}^2(Y, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $\{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_b\}$ is a basis of $\bar{H}^2(Y, \mathbb{Q})$. Indeed, we can choose $\alpha = c_1(rE)$, where E is the exceptional divisor, and r is the smallest positive integer such that rE is Cartier.

If f is a contraction to a point, by the projection formula we get

$$\alpha \cdot \beta_i \cdot \beta_j = 0$$

and

$$\alpha^2 \cdot \beta_i = 0$$

for any $i, j = 1, \dots, b$. On the other hand, in general , we do not have an isomorphism

$$\bar{H}^2(X, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}\langle \alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_b \rangle$$

as the following example shows.

Example 4.3. Let $Z = \mathbb{P}^2$ and consider the $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle

$$Y = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_Z \oplus \mathcal{O}_Z(2))$$

over Z with induced morphism $\pi\colon Y \to Z$. Then there exists a birational morphism $f\colon Y \to X$ which contracts a section E of π into a point. In particular, X is the cone over $\mathbb{P}^2$ associated to $\mathcal{O}_Z(2)$. Note that X is terminal and $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial and $K_Y = f^*K_X + 1/2E$. Let ℓ be a line in Z and let $F = \pi^*\ell$. Then $\{E, F\}$ is a basis of $\bar{H}^2(Y, \mathbb{Z})$. On the other hand, $F' = f_*F$ is not Cartier and therefore it is not an element of $\bar{H}^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$, while $2F'$ is a generator of $\bar{H}^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$.

Given a divisorial contraction to a point $f\colon Y \to X$ within terminal threefolds, our goal is to first bound the difference $K_Y^3 - K_X^3$ and then compute the cubic F_Y associated to Y from the cubic F_X associated to X. We begin with the following:

Proposition 4.4. *Let X_0 be a smooth projective threefold and let*

$$X_0 \dashrightarrow X_1 \dashrightarrow \dots \dashrightarrow X_{k-1} \dashrightarrow X_k$$

be a sequence of steps of the minimal model program for X_0. Assume that

$$f\colon Y = X_{k-1} \to X = X_k$$

is a divisorial contraction to a point $p \in X$.

Then

$$0 < K_Y^3 - K_X^3 \leq 2^{10} b_2^2,$$

where $b_2 = b_2(X_0)$ is the second Betti number of X_0.

Proof. Let E be the exceptional divisor of f and let $a = a(E, X)$ be the discrepancy of f along E. Since X is terminal, we have that $a > 0$. Since $K_Y^3 - K_X^3 = a^3 E^3$, it is enough to bound $a^3 E^3$. The possible values of aE^3 are listed in Table 1 and 2 of [Kaw05]. In particular, we have

$$0 < aE^3 \leq 4.$$

Let $\mathcal{B}(X, p) = \{p_1, \ldots, p_k\}$ be the basket of X at p, with indices $r_1 = r(p_1), \ldots, r_k = r(p_k)$ (cf. §2.2) and let R be the least common multiple of $r_1, \ldots, r_k$. Then, [Kaw05, Lemma 2.3] implies that $E^3 \geq 1/R$. Thus,

$$0 < (aE)^3 \leq \frac{64}{(E^3)^2} \leq 64 R^2.$$

Let $\Xi = \Xi(X, p) \leq \Xi(X)$. Then Lemma 2.2 implies that

$$R \leq 4 \cdot \Xi$$

and Proposition 2.3 implies

$$(aE)^3 \leq 2^{10} b_2^2.$$

Thus, the claim follows. □

We now study the behavior of the cubic form associated to a terminal threefold, under a divisorial contraction to a point. We begin with the following elementary fact:

Lemma 4.5. *Let A be a maximal rank submodule of $\mathbb{Z}^m$ and let r be a positive integer. Assume that for any $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ we have that $r \cdot b \in A$. Let $T \in \mathrm{GL}(m, \mathbb{Z})$ be a matrix whose columns form a basis of A.*

Then $|\det T| \leq r^m$.

Proof. By assumption, there exists $X \in \mathrm{GL}(m, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $T \cdot X = rI_m$, where $I_m \in \mathrm{SL}(m, \mathbb{Z})$ is the identity matrix. Thus, $\det T$ divides r^m and the claim follows. □

Lemma 4.6. *Let X and Y be $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective threefolds with terminal singularities and let $f \colon Y \to X$ be a divisorial contraction onto a point $x \in X$ with exceptional divisor E.*

Then $\pi_1(E) = 1$ and, in particular, $H^2(E, \mathbb{Z})$ is torsion-free.

Proof. Let U be an analytic neighborhood of x such that U retracts to x and consider the morphism $f_U\colon V = f^{-1}(U) \to U$. Then, [Kol93b, Theorem 7.8] implies that $\pi_1(V) = \pi_1(U) = 1$. Since V retracts to E, it follows that $\pi_1(E) = 1$.

The universal coefficient theorem implies that $H^2(E, \mathbb{Z})$ is torsion free. □

Thus, we have:

Proposition 4.7. *Let X and Y be $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective threefolds with terminal singularities and let $f\colon Y \to X$ be a divisorial contraction onto a point with exceptional divisor E. Let $\alpha \in \bar{H}^2(Y, \mathbb{Z})$ be a generator of the ray $\mathbb{R}_{>0}[E]$ in $N^1(Y) \otimes \mathbb{R}$. Let $n = b_2(Y)$ and let $\alpha_1 = \alpha, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$ be a basis of $\bar{H}^2(Y, \mathbb{Z})$. Let $r = |\alpha^3|$.*

Then there exists $T \in \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $|\det T| \leq r^n$ and $\{T(\alpha_i)\}$ is a basis of the submodule of $\bar{H}^2(Y, \mathbb{Z})$ spanned by $f^*\bar{H}^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ and α.

In particular, it follows that

$$T \cdot F_Y = ax_0^3 + F_X(x_1, \dots, x_n),$$

where $a = \alpha^3$.

Proof. Fix an isomorphism $\bar{H}^2(Y, \mathbb{Z}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}^n$ and consider the submodule A of $\mathbb{Z}^n$ spanned by $f^*\bar{H}^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ and α. Let $\beta \in \bar{H}^2(Y, \mathbb{Z})$. Then there exist integers c, b with $|b| \leq r$ such that

$$(c\alpha + b\beta).\alpha^2 = 0.$$

Set $\gamma = c\alpha + b\beta$. Consider the exact sequence

$$0 \to f^*\bar{H}^2(X, \mathbb{Z}) \to \bar{H}^2(Y, \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{p} H^2(E, \mathbb{Z}).$$

Possibly passing to a desingularization, we can apply [KM92, Proposition 12.1.6] to obtain that $p(E)$ is a multiple of $p(\gamma)$ in $H^2(E, \mathbb{Q})$. Since $\gamma.\alpha^2 = 0$, it follows that $p(\gamma)$ is a torsion element of $H^2(E, \mathbb{Z})$, which implies that $p(\gamma) = 0$ by Lemma 4.6 and so $\gamma \in f^*\bar{H}^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$.

Thus, $b\beta \in A$ and Lemma 4.5 implies the claim. □

We now consider divisorial contraction to a smooth curve. We begin with the following well known result (e.g. see [OVdV95, Prop. 14]):

Proposition 4.8. *Let X be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective threefold and let C be a smooth curve of genus g contained in the smooth locus of X. Let $f\colon Y \to X$ be the blow-up of X along C and let $\alpha = c_1(E)$.*

Then $H^2(Y, \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}[\alpha] \bigoplus H^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ and

$$K_Y^3 - K_X^3 = -2K_X.C + 2 - 2g = -2E^3 + 6 - 6g.$$

In particular, if $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ is a basis of $H^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$, then $\alpha, f^*\beta_1, \dots, f^*\beta_n$ is a basis of $H^2(Y, \mathbb{Z})$ and with respect to these basis we have:

$$F_Y(x_0, \dots, x_n) = ax_0^3 + 3x_0^2(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i x_i) + F_X(x_1, \dots, x_n),$$

where $a = \alpha^3$ and $b_i = -\beta_i.C$.

As a consequence, we have:

Theorem 4.9. *Let X be a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial projective threefold and let C be a smooth curve contained in the smooth locus of X. Let $f\colon Y \to X$ be the blow-up of X along C.*

Then

$$|K_Y^3 - K_X^3| \leq 2S_Y + 6(b_3(Y) + 1)$$

where S_Y is as in definition 2.13. Moreover, the same inequality is true after replacing $b_3(Y)$ by $Ib_3(Y) = \dim IH^3(Y, \mathbb{Q})$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.16 and Lemma 2.17 and since E and C are smooth, we have that

$$b_3(Y) - b_3(X) = Ib_3(Y) - Ib_3(X) = 2g.$$

Moreover, considering the cubic F_Y associated to Y and applying Lemma 4.8, we have that $|E^3| \leq S_Y$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |K_Y^3 - K_X^3| &= |-2E^3 + 6 - 6g| \\ &\leq 2S_Y + 6(b_3(Y) + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the claim follows. □

Although it will not be used in the proof of our main Theorem, the following result is an interesting consequence of Theorem 3.1:

Proposition 4.10. *Let $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x_0, \dots, x_n]_3$ be a non-degenerate cubic with non-zero discriminant Δ_F and let s be a positive integer. Consider the set $\mathcal{P}$ of cubics $G \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_3$ such that there exist*

1. *a terminal $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial 3-fold X with $F = F_X$ and $\Xi(X) \leq s$;*
2. *a terminal $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial 3-fold Z with $G = G_Z$ and*
3. *a birational morphism $f\colon X \to Z$ which is a divisorial contraction to a point or to a smooth curve contained in the smooth locus of Z.*

Then the quotient of $\mathcal{P}$ by the natural action of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ is finite.

Proof. Let X, Z and $f : X \to Z$ be as in (1), (2) and (3). The possible non-Gorenstein points of X are determined by $\Xi(X)$ and as in the proof of Proposition 4.4 this gives a bound for E^3 just in term of s. Let $\alpha \in \bar{H}^2(Y, \mathbb{Z})$ be a generator of the ray $\mathbb{R}_{>0}[E]$ in $N^1(Y) \otimes \mathbb{R}$. Since we can bound the index of X we can also bound α^3.

Now we can just combine the results of this section with Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 3.20. □

4.3. **Proof of the main theorem.** We can finally prove our main Theorem:

Theorem 4.11. *Let X be a smooth complex projective threefold which is not uniruled and let F_X be its associated cubic. Assume that $\Delta_{F_X} \neq 0$ and that there exists a birational moprhism $f\colon X \to Y$ onto a minimal projective threefold Y, which is a obtained as a composition of divisorial contractions to points and blow-downs to smooth curves in smooth loci.*

Then there exists a constant D depending only on the topology of the 6-manifold underlying X such that

$$|K_X^3| \leq D.$$

Proof. Let

$$X = X_0 \to X_1 \to \ldots \to X_k$$

be an MMP for X such that each $f_i : X_i \to X_{i+1}$ is a divisorial contraction to a point or to a smooth curve contained in the smooth locus of X_{i+1}.

Denote by F_i the cubic form associated to X_i and let $S_i = S_{X_i}$ (cf. Definition 2.13). Theorem 3.1 implies that $S_{X_0} < +\infty$.

We proceed by induction on $i = 0, \ldots, k$. By combining together Proposition 4.8, Proposition 4.7, Proposition 3.20 and Theorem 3.1, it follows that, for any $i = 0, \ldots, k$,

$$\Delta(F_i) \neq 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_i < +\infty.$$

Moreover, each S_i depends only on F_X and, therefore, only on the topology of X.

We define

$$D_k = 72\left(b_1(X) + b_3(X) + \frac{1}{12}b_2(X)\right)$$

and for any $i < k$, let

$$D_i = D_{i+1} + \max\{2^{10}b_2(X)^2, 2S_i + 6(Ib_3(X_i) + 1)\}.$$

We claim that

$$|K_{X_i}^3| \leq D_i$$

for any $i = 0, \ldots, k$.

The proof is by descending induction on $i = k, \dots, 0$. If $i = k$ the result is exactly Theorem 4.1. Assume now that $i < k$ and $|K^3_{X_{i+1}}| \leq D_{i+1}$. Then the claim follows by combining Proposition 4.4 and Theorem 4.9.

In particular, we have that $|K^3_X| \leq D_0$. Theorem 3.1 implies that $Ib_3(X_i) \leq b_3(X)$ for any $i = 1, \dots, k$. Thus, the Theorem follows. □

References

[BBD82] A. A. Beĭlinson, J. Bernstein, and P. Deligne, *Faisceaux pervers*, Analysis and topology on singular spaces, I (Luminy, 1981), Astérisque, vol. 100, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1982, pp. 5–171. 12

[Cai05] M. Caibăr, *Minimal models of canonical 3-fold singularities and their Betti numbers*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2005), no. 26, 1563–1581. 11

[CH11] J.A. Chen and C.D. Hacon, *Factoring 3-fold flips and divisorial contractions to curves*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **657** (2011), 173–197. 5, 6

[Che06] I. Cheltsov, *Nonrational nodal quartic threefolds*, Pacific J. Math. **226** (2006), no. 1, 65–81. 12

[Che13] J. A. Chen, *Birational maps of 3-folds*, ArXiv e-prints 1304.5949 (2013). 5

[CZ12] P. Cascini and D.-Q. Zhang, *Effective finite generation for adjoint rings*, 2012. 3, 7

[Del74] P. Deligne, *Théorie de Hodge. III*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1974), no. 44, 5–77. 13

[GKZ94] I. M. Gel'fand, M. M. Kapranov, and A. V. Zelevinsky, *Discriminants, resultants, and multidimensional determinants*, Mathematics: Theory & Applications, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1994. 8

[Hir54] F. Hirzebruch, *Some problems on differentiable and complex manifolds*, Ann. of Math. (2) **60** (1954), 213–236. 1

[Kaw86] Y. Kawamata, *On the plurigenera of minimal algebraic* 3*-folds with* $k \equiv 0$, Math. Ann. **275** (1986), no. 4, 539–546. 7

[Kaw05] M. Kawakita, *Three-fold divisorial contractions to singularities of higher indices*, Duke Math. J. **130** (2005), no. 1, 57–126. 4, 38

[KM92] J. Kollár and S. Mori, *Classification of three-dimensional flips*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **5** (1992), 533–703. 13, 39

[KM98] ———, *Birational Geometry of Algebraic Varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 134, Cambridge University Press, 1998. 3, 5, 7

[Kol89] J. Kollár, *Flops*, Nagoya Math. J. **113** (1989), 15–36. 11

[Kol93a] ———, *Effective base point freeness*, Math. Ann. **296** (1993), no. 4, 595–605. 3

[Kol93b] J. Kollár, *Shafarevich maps and plurigenera of algebraic varieties*, Invent. Math. **113** (1993), no. 1, 177–215. 39

[Kot08] D. Kotschick, *Chern numbers and diffeomorphism types of projective varieties*, J. Topol. **1** (2008), no. 2, 518–526. 2

[Kot12] ———, *Topologically invariant Chern numbers of projective varieties*, Adv. Math. **229** (2012), no. 2, 1300–1312. 2

[Lan83] S. Lang, *Fundamentals of Diophantine geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983. 9

[Laz04] R. Lazarsfeld, *Positivity in Algebraic Geometry. I*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, vol. 48, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. 6

[LeB99] C. LeBrun, *Topology versus Chern numbers for complex* 3*-folds*, Pacific J. Math. **191** (1999), no. 1, 123–131. 2

[Miy87] Y. Miyaoka, *The chern classes and Kodaira dimension of a minimal variety*, Advanced Studies in Pure Math. vol 10, Algebraic Geometry Sendai 85, Kinokuniya-North Holland, 1987, pp. 449–476. 7

[Mor85] S. Mori, *On* 3*-dimensional terminal singularities*, Nagoya Math. J. **98** (1985), 43–66. 6

[OVdV95] C. Okonek and A. Van de Ven, *Cubic forms and complex* 3*-folds*, Enseign. Math. (2) **41** (1995), no. 3-4, 297–333. 2, 4, 10, 11, 29, 39

[Rei87] M. Reid, *Young person's guide to canonical singularities*, Algebraic Geometry Bowdoin 1985 (Proc. Symp. Pure Math., ed.), 1987, pp. 345–416. 6, 7

[Sai88] M. Saito, *Modules de Hodge polarisables*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **24** (1988), no. 6, 849–995. 13

[Ste83] J. H. M. Steenbrink, *Mixed Hodge structures associated with isolated singularities*, Singularities, Part 2 (Arcata, Calif., 1981), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 40, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1983, pp. 513–536. 13

[Stu93] B. Sturmfels, *Algorithms in invariant theory*, Texts and Monographs in Symbolic Computation, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1993. 9

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, 180 Queen's Gate, London SW7 2AZ, UK

E-mail address: p.cascini@imperial.ac.uk

Max Planck Institute for Mathematics, Vivatsgasse 7, 53111, Bonn, Germay.

E-mail address: tasin@mpim-bonn.mpg.de